

# MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXVI

November 1928

NUMBER 2

## M. BERGERET ET LA CRIMINOLOGIE

**O**N DISCUTE, chez le libraire Paillot, entre habitués du "coin des bouquins," le cas de l'assassin Lecœur. Le docteur Fornerol tend à le considérer comme un dégénéré naturellement pré-disposé au crime:

On reconnaît aujourd'hui que le délinquant est un dégénéré. Ainsi, grâce à l'obligeance de Monsieur Ossian Colot, il m'a été loisible d'examiner notre assassin, le sujet Lecœur. Je lui ai trouvé des tares physiologiques. ... La denture, par exemple, est anormale. J'en conclus à une responsabilité mitigée.

—Pourtant, dit M. Bergeret, une sœur de Mithridate avait une double rangée de dents à chaque mâchoire. Et son frère la tenait pour magnanime. Il l'aimait si chèrement que, poursuivi par Lucullus, il ordonna, dans sa fuite, de la faire étrangler par un muet pour qu'elle ne tombât pas vivante aux mains des Romains. Elle ne démentit pas alors la bonne opinion que Mithridate avait d'elle. Elle reçut le lacet avec une sérénité joyeuse et dit: "Je rends grâce au roi, mon frère, d'avoir, au milieu des soins qui l'assiègent, gardé le souci de mon honneur." Vous voyez par cet exemple qu'on peut être héroïque avec une denture anormale.

—Le sujet Lecœur, reprit le médecin, présente d'autres particularités qui, pour l'homme de science, ne laissent pas d'être significatives. Comme beaucoup de criminels de naissance, il ne jouit que d'une sensibilité obtuse. J'ai pu l'examiner. Il est tatoué sur tout le corps. Et l'on est surpris de la fantaisie lubrique qui déterminait le choix des scènes et des attributs dessinés sur sa peau.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. France, *Le Mannequin d'osier*, *Oeuvres complètes*, XI (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1926), 355. *Le Mannequin d'osier*, publié chez Calmann-Lévy en septembre 1897, avait déjà paru dans *l'Echo de Paris*, du 10 novembre 1896 au 6 juillet 1897; le chapitre XI, d'où est tirée la page ci-dessus, se trouve dans les numéros des 2, 9, et 16 mars 1897.

Sauf indication contraire, nous citons A. France d'après l'édition des *Oeuvres complètes*.

Plaisante joute, où la philologie est sommairement désarçonnée par la criminologie. Mais à quel arsenal les deux champions ont-ils emprunté leurs arguments?

Le docteur Fornerol est au courant des travaux de la nouvelle école d'anthropologie criminelle, et bien qu'il ne cite pas Lombroso, il est facile de reconnaître dans ses discours les doctrines du célèbre criminologiste. Aurait-il donc lu l'*Uomo delinquente* dans l'original italien, l'*Homme criminel* dans la version française, ou quelque une des innombrables études provoquées par cet ouvrage fameux?

Il ne s'est peut-être pas donné cette peine: le plus clair de sa science pourrait bien venir d'un simple article sur *Les Criminels*, publié dans le *Temps* du 18 mars 1888 par M. Anatole France à propos d'un roman d'Hector Malot.<sup>1</sup> Nous y trouvons déjà nettement exprimée l'idée que le criminel est un dégénéré, dont la responsabilité n'est pas entière, et qu'il est possible de reconnaître à certaines tares caractéristiques:

L'anthropologie ne voit plus dans le criminel qu'un malade incurable; elle regarde le scélérat avec une tranquille pitié. ...

Le déterminisme nous a tous plus ou moins touchés. La doctrine de la responsabilité est ébranlée dans les esprits les plus fermes. ...

Irons-nous plus loin et tiendrons-nous, avec la nouvelle école anthropologique, l'irresponsabilité du criminel comme physiologiquement, anatomiquement démontrée? Dirons-nous avec Maudsley que le crime est dans le sang, qu'il y a des scélérats dans une société, comme il y a des moutons à tête noire dans un troupeau, et que ceux-là sont aussi faciles à distinguer que ceux-ci? Entrerons-nous dans les vues d'un anthropologiste italien des plus convaincus, l'auteur de l'*Uomo delinquente*?

M. Cesare Lombroso se flatte de constater l'existence d'un type humain voué au crime par son organisation même. Il y a, selon lui, un criminel-né, reconnaissable à divers signes dont les plus caractéristiques sont: la petitesse et l'asymétrie du crâne, le développement des mâchoires, les yeux caves, la barbe rare, la chevelure abondante, les oreilles mal ourlées, le nez camus. En outre les criminels sont ou doivent être gauchers, daltoniens, louches et débiles.<sup>2</sup>

A. France ne cite dans cet article ni la denture anormale ni la sensibilité obtuse parmi les stigmates caractéristiques du criminel-

<sup>1</sup> Recueilli dans *La Vie littéraire*, II, 401-8.

<sup>2</sup> *Vie lit.*, II, 404, 405, 406.

né, mais la thèse qu'il y discute est déjà celle contre laquelle M. Bergeret s'insurgera.

D'autre part, où donc l'ingénieux philologue a-t-il pris l'argument inattendu qu'il oppose sans succès aux affirmations de son interlocuteur?

Par une fortune singulière, il ne semble point tout à fait d'accord avec Valère-Maxime non plus qu'avec Ammien-Marcellin qui ont, l'un signalé cette denture anormale, l'autre raconté la mort de la malheureuse qui en était affligée. Selon Valère-Maxime, c'était une fille, et non point une sœur de Mithridate qui était armée d'une double rangée de dents, et d'ailleurs à une seule mâchoire et non point aux deux:

Mithridatis vero regis filia Drypetina, Laodice regina nata, duplici ordine dentium deformis admodum comes fugae patris a Pompeo devicti fuit.<sup>1</sup>

Ammien-Marcellin, de son côté, nous apprend que cette même Drypetina mourut poignardée par un eunuque, et non point étranglée par un muet, après la défaite infligée à Mithridate par Pompée, et non point par Lucullus:

Ingenti proelio superatus a Romanis et Pompeio rex praedictus, fugiensque ad regna Colchorum, adultam filiam nomine Drypetinam vexatam asperitate morborum in castello Synhorio huic Menophilo commissam reliquit: qui virginem omni remediorum solatio plene curatam patri tutissime servans, cum a Manlio Prisco Imperatoris legato munimentum, quo clauderetur, obsideri coepisset, defensoresque eius deditionem meditari sentiret: veritus ne parentis opprobrio puella nobilis captiva superesset et violata, interfecta illa mox gladium in viscera sua compegit.<sup>2</sup>

Il est trop évident que M. Bergeret a négligé de remonter aux textes. Mais alors où a-t-il trouvé sa fallacieuse érudition dentaire?

Tout simplement dans un article de M. Anatole France, paru dans le *Temps* du 23 août 1891:<sup>3</sup> le Maître, y rendant compte du savant ouvrage de Théodore Reinach sur *Mithridate Eupator*,<sup>4</sup> ne manquait point de signaler en bonne place l'infortunée Drypétina:

Il [Mithridate] semble avoir beaucoup aimé sa fille Drypétina, un monstre qui avait une double rangée de dents à chaque mâchoire, et s'il la fit poignarder par un eunuque, ce fut pour qu'elle ne tombât pas vivante aux mains des Romains.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Valère-Maxime, I, viii, ext. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Ammien-Marcellin, XVI, 7, 10.

<sup>3</sup> Recueilli dans *La Vie littéraire*, IV, 704-717, "M. Théodore Reinach et Mithridate."

<sup>4</sup> Théodore Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator, Roi de Pont*. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1890.

<sup>5</sup> *Vie lit.*, IV, 715.

M. Bergeret ajoute, il est vrai, à une source d'information déjà douteuse, quelques erreurs de son cru. La double rangée de dents à chaque mâchoire, l'affection de Mithridate pour Drypétina, l'ordre de mort donné par le roi, tout est déjà dans l'article du *Temps*. Mais, dans le savant argument de M. Bergeret, la fille se métamorphose en sœur, le poignard en lacet,—et l'eunuque en muet, car M. Bergeret a l'âme sensible et pudique. Enfin, d'où sort ce Lucullus intempestif? M. Bergeret l'a extrait, sans autre forme de procès, du paragraphe où A. France racontait le drame de Pharnacie:

Après la défaite infligée, à Cabira, par Lucullus, à l'armée pontique, Mithridate, en fuite sur Comana, dépêcha l'eunuque Bacchidès à Pharnacie avec l'ordre de faire mourir toutes les femmes du sérail.<sup>1</sup>

Malheureusement, il s'agissait là d'une autre campagne, d'une autre victoire romaine, d'un autre général, d'un autre eunuque et d'autres femmes. La victoire de Lucullus à Cabira, et le massacre de Pharnacie remontent en effet à 71 av. J.-C.; et c'est seulement entre 65 et 64 av. J.-C. qu'il faut placer la mort de Drypétina, pendant les opérations qui, sous la direction de Pompée et en l'absence de Mithridate, firent tomber entre les mains des Romains les dernières forteresses pontiques. M. Bergeret, en relisant, un peu hâtivement, l'article du *Temps*, a contaminé deux passages voisins, et confondu ainsi deux drames qui s'étaient joués aux deux extrémités du royaume de Pont à plusieurs années d'intervalle.

Quant aux nobles paroles qu'il attribue à la "sœur de Mithridate," elles ne sont que l'écho de celles qu'A. France, dans son récit de la tragédie de Pharnacie, prête à l'une des sœurs du roi, qu'il appelle Roxane. Tandis qu'une autre maudissait Mithridate,

Roxane, au contraire, le loua de ce qu'au milieu des dangers qu'il courait lui-même, il ne les avait pas oubliées, et leur avait assuré une mort libre, à l'abri des outrages.<sup>2</sup>

M. Bergeret s'est contenté de traduire cette action de grâces en des termes d'une noblesse plus racinienne.

Tout de force vraiment remarquable, la docte affirmation de M. Bergeret ne renferme donc pas un seul détail exact: ce monstre était la fille de Mithridate, et non point sa sœur; sa difformité n'affectait qu'une seule de ses mâchoires, et non point les deux; Mithridate était

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 715-16.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 716.



alors aux prises avec Pompée, et non plus avec Lucullus; il n'eut point à ordonner la mort de sa fille, car Ménophile la tua de sa propre autorité; Ménophile n'était point un muet, mais un eunuque; il n'étrangla point Drypétina, mais la poignarda; et les dernières paroles de la malheureuse sont apocryphes.

Par un hasard curieux, nous retrouvons ainsi, à l'origine des arguments prêtés respectivement au docteur Fornerol et à M. Bergeret, deux articles d'A. France lui-même, parus plusieurs années avant le *Mannequin d'osier*, et recueillis dans la *Vie littéraire*.

Quelle confiance accorder à ces deux sources du *Mannequin d'osier*? Comment A. France, en rendant compte de l'*Homme criminel* de Lombroso et du *Mithridate Eupator* de Reinach, s'est-il acquitté de son rôle de critique?

C'est en essayant d'analyser *Conscience*, d'Hector Malot, que le critique littéraire du *Temps* en vient à discuter les théories de la nouvelle école d'anthropologie criminelle. Subissant lui aussi l'obsession du roman russe récemment révélé au public français, il commence par comparer le héros de *Conscience* à celui de *Crime et Châtiment*. Cela l'amène à poser le problème de la responsabilité, et à examiner les doctrines récentes qui tiennent "l'irresponsabilité du criminel comme physiologiquement et anatomiquement démontrée."

Après une brève allusion à la célèbre phrase de Maudsley sur les criminels et les moutons à tête noire,<sup>1</sup> il aborde l'exposé et la discussion des doctrines de Lombroso. A-t-il lu l'*Uomo delinquente*, et en italien, comme il le laisse entendre? C'est possible, mais il est certain qu'il met d'abord à contribution la *Préface* de Ch. Létourneau à la traduction française publiée, en 1887, sous le titre de l'*Homme criminel*.<sup>2</sup> On en jugera sans peine:

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Maudsley, *Le crime et la folie*, trad. française, Paris: Alcan: "Tous ceux qui ont étudié les criminels savent qu'il existe une classe distincte d'êtres voués au mal... Cette classe criminelle est marquée par des caractères particuliers d'infériorité physique et mentale. Cette sorte d'individus, a-t-on justement dit, est aussi distinctement reconnaissable de la classe des ouvriers honnêtes et bien nés qu'un mouton à tête noire l'est de toutes les autres races de moutons." Il nous a été impossible de déterminer exactement où A. France avait pu trouver cette définition, très fréquemment citée alors; cf. H. Joly, *Le Crime*, Paris, 1888, p. 293: "On connaît la description si sombre de Maudsley, elle a fait le tour de toutes les publications scientifiques."

<sup>2</sup> Cesare Lombroso, *L'Homme criminel, étude anthropologique et médico-légale*... traduit sur la 4<sup>e</sup> édition italienne par Mr. G. Régner et Mr. A. Bornet, avec préface par M. Létourneau. Paris, Turin, 1887.

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, II

P. 406. M. Lombroso se flatte de constater l'existence d'un type humain voué au crime par son organisation même. Il y a, selon lui, un criminel-né,

reconnaissable à plusieurs signes dont les plus caractéristiques sont: la petitesse et l'asymétrie du crâne, le développement des mâchoires, les yeux caves,

la barbe rare, la chevelure abondante, les oreilles mal ourlées,

le nez camus.

En outre, les criminels sont ou doivent être gauchers, daltoniens, louches ou débiles.

CH. LETOURNEAU, *Préface*

P. iv. Cette enquête scientifique ... a mis en lumière un fait de la plus haute importance: l'existence d'un type humain voué au crime par son organisation même, d'un criminel-né ...

... Le criminel complet, réunissant la plupart des caractères de son type, a généralement une faible capacité crânienne, une mandibule pesante et développée, une grande capacité orbitaire ...

... Son crâne est souvent anormal, asymétrique. La barbe est rare ou absente, mais la chevelure est abondante. L'insertion des oreilles est communément en anse. Aussi souvent le nez est tordu ou camus

... Les criminels sont sujets au daltonisme; la proportion des gauchers est, chez eux, triple. Leur force musculaire est faible ...

A. France fait ensuite à l'anthropologiste italien les objections courantes: les prétendus stigmates criminels "manquent à la plupart des criminels, et se trouvent, par contre, chez beaucoup de fort honnêtes gens"; M. Lombroso n'est pas "en état d'annoncer avec certitude, après examen, que tel sujet sera criminel ou que tel autre restera innocent"; ses recherches sur le type criminel sont vaines, parce qu'il n'a examiné que des prisonniers, déjà déformés par la captivité; enfin, il est impossible de ramener les criminels "à un type unique, soit physiologique, soit psychologique." Rien de bien original jusque là: ces objections ont été maintes fois formulées au cours des nombreuses polémiques suscitées par l'*Homme criminel*.

Voici plus curieux: on sait qu'un des points fondamentaux de la doctrine lombrosienne est l'explication de la criminalité par l'atavisme. Le crime, universellement répandu chez l'homme primitif, est encore naturel à l'animal et au sauvage, et, s'il "n'a cessé de se produire même dans les races les plus cultivées, la vraie cause en réside dans l'atavisme."<sup>1</sup> Or, A. France fait gravement à Lombroso cette critique

<sup>1</sup> C. Lombroso, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

inattendue: "Quoi qu'en disent Lombroso et Maudsley, on peut être criminel sans être fou ni malade. L'humanité a commencé tout entière par le crime. Chez l'homme préhistorique le crime était la règle et non l'exception. De nos jours encore, il est de règle chez les sauvages. On peut dire qu'il se confond, dans ses origines, avec la vertu."<sup>1</sup>

Reste à démontrer cette proposition; et comment le faire plus commodément qu'en empruntant aussi à Lombroso quelques unes de ses propres preuves:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, II

P. 407. Il [le crime] n'en est pas encore distinct [de la vertu] chez les peuplades noires de l'Afrique centrale.

*Mteza, roi du Touareg, tuait chaque jour trois ou quatre femmes de son harem.*

Un jour il fit mettre à mort une de ses femmes coupable de lui avoir présenté une fleur.

C. LOMBROSO, *Homme criminel*

P. 51. Dans l'Afrique centrale comme en Mélanésie, la femme est tuée par son mari pour le motif le plus frivole.

P. 45. Speke entendit un jour un roi du Kouareg ordonner à son page de tuer un de ses courtisans ...

P. 51. Le fameux monarque Mtesa fait périr chaque jour des odalisques de son harem ...

P. 45. Il ne se passait point de jour qu'il [Speke] ne vît traîner au supplice quelqu'une de ses femmes [de Mtesa], quelquefois trois, quatre; et toujours pour des causes ridicules, pour lui avoir par exemple présenté une fleur.

Mais comment expliquer qu'A. France lise *Touareg* là où Lombroso avait écrit *Kouareg*? A-t-il inconsciemment substitué à un nom inconnu un nom connu? Ou bien a-t-il en connaissance de cause corrigé une erreur de Lombroso? Remontons à la source de l'*Homme criminel*, au *Journal de la découverte de la source du Nil*, du Capitaine Speke, au voyage de Stanley *A travers le continent noir*.<sup>2</sup> Nous y retrouvons sans peine Mtésa, mais point le Touareg, ni le Kouareg, pour

<sup>1</sup> *Vie lit.*, II, 407. Cf. Lombroso, *op. cit.*, p. 651: "Les études qui forment la troisième partie de ce volume s'accordent admirablement avec celles qui ont été développées dans la seconde, pour nous faire voir dans le criminel l'homme sauvage et en même temps l'homme malade."

<sup>2</sup> J. H. Speke, *Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile*, Edinburgh and London, 1863; H. M. Stanley, *Through the Dark Continent*, London, 1878.

l'excellente raison que Mtéza régnait sur l'Ouganda, qui se trouve non point en Afrique centrale, mais en Afrique orientale.<sup>1</sup>

"Comment ne pas le reconnaître, poursuit A. France, c'est la nature même qui enseigne le crime. Les animaux tuent leurs semblables pour les dévorer, ou par fureur jalouse ou sans aucun motif. Il y a beaucoup de criminels parmi eux."<sup>2</sup> C'est précisément l'opinion de Lombroso, qui a consacré tout son premier chapitre au crime chez les plantes et les animaux. A. France ne l'ignore point:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, II

P. 408. La *férocité* des *fourmis* est effroyable;

les *femelles des lapins* dévorent souvent leurs *petits*;  
les *loups*, quoi qu'on en dise, se mangent entre eux;

on a vu des *femelles d'orangs-outangs* tuer une rivale.

C. LOMBROSO, *Homme criminel*

P. 4. Un exemple de meurtre par avidité nous est fourni par les *fourmis* qui élèvent et font paître des aphides pour en sucer la sécrétion sucrée, et qui même quelquefois préfèrent se procurer ces troupeaux par la rapine en *massacrant* leurs propriétaires. ...

P. 6. Parmi les chats, les lièvres, les *lapins*, il en est qui *mangent leurs petits*.

P. 4. En dépit du proverbe qui prétend le contraire, les *loups* se mangent entre eux.

P. 10. Il y a des *femelles* qui ont une aversion indicible pour les individus de leur espèce et de leur sexe. Cela s'observe, par exemple, chez les singes anthropomorphes et surtout chez les *orangs-outans*, dont les *femelles* traitent leurs semblables avec une animosité instinctive, les battent et arrivent même jusqu'à les tuer.

Voilà une singulière méthode critique: pour l'exposé de la doctrine de Lombroso, quelques détails découpés dans la *Préface* de Ch.

<sup>1</sup> Ajoutons que Speke et Stanley insistent sur la cruauté de Mtesa envers ses femmes durant les premières années de son règne; mais nulle trace de cette malheureuse mise à mort pour lui avoir présenté une fleur. Tout au plus Speke parle-t-il d'une femme condamnée à mort par le roi pour lui avoir offert un fruit au cours d'une promenade (*Journal* ... , p. 394). Mais si Lombroso avait lu une page de plus, il aurait vu que Mtesa fit grâce, à la prière de Speke, et il ne l'aurait point injustement chargé d'un meurtre de plus. Voilà qui éclaire singulièrement les méthodes de travail du criminologiste italien.

<sup>2</sup> *Vie lit.*, II, 408.

Létourneau, et transcrits presque littéralement, dans le même ordre; pour la réfutation, quelques objections courantes, mais surtout un argument qui est précisément l'argument fondamental de Lombroso, étayé, pour comble d'impudence, de preuves empruntées à l'*Homme criminel* même. On ne saurait triompher à meilleur compte.

Retrouverons-nous cette inconscience dans le compte-rendu de *Mithridate Eupator*? Cette fois, il faut le reconnaître, le critique ne cherche point à nous en imposer: "Les ouvrages de pure érudition, avoue-t-il bonnement, ne sont point de ma compétence et ne peuvent faire la substance d'une de ces causeries littéraires qui veulent des sujets faciles et variés. Le spécial et le particulier ne sont point notre fait."<sup>1</sup> Nous voilà prévenus: ne nous attendons point à une fidélité miraculeuse. De fait, l'article semble consister surtout en une compilation de détails anecdotiques, découpés dans les chapitres les moins arides de l'ouvrage de Reinach.

Cependant, sur la question des sources de l'histoire de Mithridate, A. France fait preuve d'une érudition au premier abord surprenante: il disserte des médailles, des inscriptions, et des auteurs anciens, et conclut modestement: "Le peu que j'en viens de dire m'a été inspiré par ce goût naturel qui porte chacun de nous à s'intéresser aux bonnes méthodes de travail."<sup>2</sup> Il oublie d'ajouter que ce goût était en l'occasion soutenu par le copieux appendice consacré justement par M. Reinach à ces mêmes sources: auteurs, inscriptions, et médailles.<sup>3</sup>

Suit un aperçu de la jeunesse de Mithridate, dans lequel A. France transcrit, résume, et recoud un certain nombre de détails anecdotiques, découpés d'ailleurs presque tous dans le même chapitre.<sup>4</sup> Quant aux guerres de l'Euxin et d'Asie Mineure, sans doute les trouve-t-il trop embrouillées: il les escamote.<sup>5</sup> Il conviendrait au moins de donner une idée claire du nouvel empire de Mithridate; mais toute cette géographie pontique est bien confuse: un petit paragraphe suffira, ingénieusement composé de quelques détails empruntés sans mot dire aux premières lignes d'un chapitre, et d'un bout de phrase honnête-

<sup>1</sup> *Vie lit.*, IV, 707.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Mithridate Eupator*, pp. 417-77.

<sup>4</sup> *Vie lit.*, IV, 708. Cf. *Mithridate Eupator*, pp. 33, 47, 53, 53-54, 55.

<sup>5</sup> Il se contente d'en résumer les résultats en une courte phrase, p. 708, empruntée à *Mithridate Eupator*, p. 71.

ment cité, tiré des premières lignes d'un autre chapitre.<sup>1</sup> Les campagnes contre Rome sont aussi compliquées qu'interminables: pourquoi s'exposer à s'y perdre? Mieux vaut s'en tirer par une pirouette et une citation de Racine: "On sait le reste, que je ne puis rappeler ici, même brièvement, puisque c'est, comme dit Racine, 'une partie considérable de l'histoire romaine.'" Et l'on conclut par une belle citation de Montesquieu sur l'énergie indomptable du vieux roi. Voilà qui témoigne d'une solide culture classique. Il est vrai aussi que la citation se trouvait déjà en bonne place dans la *Préface* de Th. Reinach.<sup>2</sup>

Après ce bel effort, comment ne pas se délasser en contant l'épisode d'Hypsicratée, la fidèle amazone?<sup>3</sup> Et nous voilà tout doucement arrivés aux suprêmes efforts de Mithridate: vite, appelons Racine à la rescousse, et le prince Eugène, et M. Reinach, et Michelet, et Mommsen. Puis enterrons notre héros;<sup>4</sup> nous serons libres alors de citer une page de M. Reinach, pour donner du poids à notre article. Après quoi, ayant fait notre devoir de critique, rien ne nous empêchera d'évoquer Mithridate intime; et si, chemin faisant, nous prenons le Pirée pour un homme et le bourg d'Améria pour un dieu perse, qu'importe?<sup>5</sup>

Ce sont surtout les meurtres domestiques commis ou ordonnés par Mithridate qui semblent avoir retenu l'attention de notre ingénieux commentateur: il met son étude et ses soins à en rassembler les exemples.

Il commence par des considérations générales, où l'idée de l'enchaînement des crimes dans la famille royale, suggérée par le souvenir des Atrides, s'appuie sur des faits tirés directement d'une des dernières pages de Th. Reinach:

<sup>1</sup> *Vie lit.*, IV, 708-9; *Mithridate Eupator*, pp. 250 et 214.

<sup>2</sup> *Vie lit.*, IV, 709; *Mithridate Eupator*, p. iv. La référence exacte de la citation de Montesquieu est indiquée en note par Th. Reinach, *loc. cit.*; cf. aussi *ibid.*, p. 280, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Vie lit.*, IV, 709; *Mithridate Eupator*, p. 387.

<sup>4</sup> *Vie lit.*, IV, 711-12; *Mithridate Eupator*, pp. 411-12.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Vie lit.*, IV, 714: "Il [Mithridate] apparaissait, dans le feu des pierreries, comme 'image, sur la terre, des dieux-astres, Ormuzd et Améria, auxquels il allumait en offrande une forêt sur une montagne.'" A. France fait allusion ici au sacrifice décrit dans *Mithridate Eupator*, p. 289; quant au nom d'Améria, il l'a trouvé à la page 240 du même ouvrage: "Son sanctuaire [du *Men Pharnace*] était situé au bourg d'Améria, près de Cabira, et la famille royale l'entourait d'une vénération particulière."

Pour la source des autres détails donnés sur Mithridate pp. 714 et 715, cf. *Mithridate Eupator*, pp. 277, 276, 286, 287, 289, 276, 286, 281-82, 283-85.

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 715. Comme tous les dynastes d'Orient, il avait une grande habitude du meurtre domestique. *Quatre de ses fils périrent par son ordre: Ariarathe, Mithridate, Macharès et Xipharès.* Mais il faut voir l'enchaînement des crimes dans cette maison et se rappeler que sa mère avait tenté de le faire tuer, et qu'enfin *un fils qu'il avait épargné, Pharnace*, fut cause de sa mort.

TH. REINACH, *Mithridate*

Pp. 405-406. Mithridate, on le sait, avait été le bourreau de sa famille. *Quatre de ses fils Ariarathe, Mithridate, Macharès, Xipharès, avaient souffert la mort par son ordre ...*

... Toute son affection, toutes ses espérances s'étaient reportées sur *Pharnace* ... Un complot fut découvert ... Cependant la tendresse paternelle et les instances d'un ministre indulgent ... l'emportèrent ... sur la raison d'Etat; Mithridate *fit grâce à son fils* ...

A. France a jusqu'ici fidèlement transcrit ou résumé; mais son exactitude laisse à désirer lorsqu'il en vient à parler de Drypétina, dans un paragraphe dont la substance est tirée de deux passages découpés, à cent pages d'intervalle, dans *Mithridate Eupator*. Dans le premier, l'historien, d'après Valère-Maxime, signalait la difformité de Drypétina, et dans le second, racontait, d'après Ammien-Marcellin, la mort de cette princesse:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 715. Il semble avoir beaucoup aimé sa fille *Drypétina, un monstre* qui avait, *une double rangée de dents à chaque mâchoire*,

et, s'il la fit *poignarder par un eunuque*, ce fut pour qu'elle ne tombât pas vivante aux mains des Romains.

TH. REINACH, *Mithridate*

P. 298. ... *Drypétina*, comme elle fille de Laodice, comme elle tendrement dévouée à son père, mais défigurée par une *monstrueuse difformité, une double rangée de dents à l'une de ses mâchoires* ...

P. 399. Sinoria, où Mithridate ... avait laissé sa fille Drypétina, fut assiégée par le légat Manlius Priscus; quand la garnison se vit à bout de ressources, le commandant, *l'eunuque Ménophile, poignarda la princesse et se tua sur son cadavre.*

Sur plusieurs points, A. France suit fidèlement l'original; des erreurs, cependant, se glissent dans sa transcription: à *chaque mâchoire*, au lieu de *à l'une de ses mâchoires*; *il la fit poignarder par un*



*eunuque*, au lieu de *l'eunuque ... la poignarda*. Nous sommes ici en présence du texte intermédiaire entre la vérité historique de *Mithridate Eupator* et la pure fantaisie du *Mannequin d'osier*.

Notre érudit rappelle ensuite les deux autres filles du roi, et sa première phrase n'est que le résumé de quelques lignes de *Mithridate Eupator*, sans autre inexactitude qu'une erreur de transcription qui, de *Nysa*, a fait *Mysa*:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 715. Deux autres de ses filles, *Mithridatis* et *Mysa*, moururent avec lui à Panticapée pour la même raison.

TH. REINACH, *Mithridate*

P. 410. Auprès de lui [à Panticapée] se trouvaient deux de ses filles, *Mithridatis* et *Nysa* ... Quant elles virent leur père préparer la coupe empoisonnée, elles demandèrent à la partager avec lui ... La première gorgée les étendit mortes.

Mais c'est surtout le massacre de Pharnacie qui, par son horreur tragique, frappe A. France. Aussi puise-t-il à plusieurs sources. Plutarque, dans sa *Vie de Lucullus*, raconte le drame sans trop se soucier d'imposer à son récit une ordonnance rigide. Il énumère d'abord celles des princesses qui se trouvaient à Pharnacie: Roxane, Statira, Bérénice, et enfin Monime, dont il nous dit les résistances aux sollicitations du roi, le consentement, les désillusions, la fin tragique. Puis il passe à la mort de Roxane, de Bérénice, et de Statira. Aucun effort pour mettre en vedette l'une des victimes aux dépens des autres: s'il ne donne à Roxane qu'un rôle effacé, Monime, Bérénice, et Statira se partagent également son attention.

Th. Reinach, au contraire, voit en Monime "la plus touchante victime de cette catastrophe." Aussi, tout en s'inspirant de Plutarque, qu'il complète au moyen d'un fragment d'Elien, il rejette dans l'ombre Roxane, Statira, et Bérénice, et pousse au premier plan Monime. Il en résulte un récit d'une composition dramatique et d'un pathétique croissant, mais aussi d'un style dont les grâces surannées trahissent plus d'application que de talent.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Th. Reinach, *op. cit.*, pp. 341-42: "Avant de quitter Comana et de se confier à la générosité douteuse de son gendre, Mithridate songea à son harem. Il l'avait expédié au début de la campagne dans la forteresse de Pharnacie, sur la côte du Paryadrès; maintenant le précieux dépôt n'était plus en sûreté. L'orgueil du sultan frémît à l'idée de voir tomber vivantes entre les mains du conquérant étranger ses femmes et ses sœurs, tout son sang et tout son amour. L'eunuque Bacchidès fut chargé d'empêcher ce déshonneur suprême. Le sinistre messenger arriva à Pharnacie, porteur de l'ordre de mort qui ne laissait aux victimes que le choix du supplice. Des trois sœurs survivantes de Mithridate, l'une, Nysa, était en prison à Cabira; les deux autres, Roxane et Statira, se trouvaient à

A. France avait certes le coup de ciseaux facile, mais il n'aurait su trouver son bien dans cette rhétorique d'archéologue. On connaît par contre son goût pour Plutarque: ce vieux Plutarque, écrivait-il dans le *Temps* quelques mois auparavant, "ce vieux Plutarque est un merveilleux narrateur," et il louait la "grâce fine" de la traduction d'Amyot.<sup>1</sup> Et comment l'éditeur de Racine aurait-il pu oublier que le poète, dans la préface de son *Mithridate*, rapporte le récit de Plutarque, d'après la traduction d'Amyot, car il a, dit-il, "une grâce dans le vieux style de ce traducteur que je ne crois point pouvoir égaler dans notre langue moderne."<sup>2</sup>

C'est donc à Plutarque qu'il remonte, et sans doute par l'intermédiaire d'Amyot. Il commence par nous présenter les sœurs et les femmes du roi qui se trouvaient à Pharnacie au moment du désastre de Cabira, dans l'ordre même adopté par Plutarque; pour l'expression, il ne fait, la plupart du temps, que rajeunir Amyot:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 715. Après la défaite infligée, à Cabira, par Lucullus, à l'armée pontique, Mithridate, en fuite sur Comana, dépêcha l'eunuque Bacchidès à Pharnacie avec ordre de faire mourir toutes les femmes du sérail. Parmi elles se trouvaient deux sœurs du roi, Roxane et Statira, âgées de quarante ans, qui n'avaient point été mariées, et deux de ses femmes, Ioniennes l'une et l'autre, Bérénice de Chios et Monime de Stratonice.

PLUTARQUE, *Lucullus*

P. 115. Mithridates envoya devers elles l'un de ses valets de chambre nommé Bacchilidès leur porter nouvelles qu'il convenoit à toutes mourir. Il y avoit entre plusieurs autres dames, deux sœurs du roy Roxane et Statira, qui avoyent bien quarante ans chacune, et toutefois n'avoient jamais esté mariées, et deux de ses femmes espousées, toutes deux du païs d'Ionie, l'une appelée Bérénice, native de l'isle de Chio, et l'autre Monime de la ville de Milet.<sup>3</sup>

Pharnacie: elles reçurent l'arrêt fatal. Roxane en maudissant son frère, Statira en le remerciant. Bérénice de Chios, une de ses concubines, partagea la coupe empoisonnée avec sa mère; la vieille femme expira sur le champ, mais la fille se tordait dans les spasmes de l'agonie quand Bacchidès, pour en finir, l'étouffa. La plus touchante victime de cette catastrophe fut une autre Grecque, Monime de Stratonice, si célèbre par la beauté et la résistance qui lui avait valu une couronne. Cette fleur d'Ionie s'étiolait dans la prison dorée du sérail; elle accepta la mort comme une délivrance; mais quand elle voulut se pendre à son bandeau, la frêle gaze de Tarente se rompit, dit-on, sous l'effort. "Haillon maudit, s'écria-t-elle, ne me rendras-tu même pas ce service?" Et elle tendit la gorge au couteau de l'eunuque impassible (été 71 av. J.-C.).

<sup>1</sup> *Temps*, 12 oct. 1890; *Vie lit.*, IV, 495.

<sup>2</sup> Racine, *Préface de Mithridate*, *Oeuvres*, III (Paris: Hachette, 1865), 19.

<sup>3</sup> Nous citons Plutarque d'après *Les vies des hommes illustres ... traduites du Grec par Jacques Amyot ... avec des notes et des observations de M. Vauvilliers ...*, Paris, 1785, in-8.

Par malheur, ayant aussi jeté sur le récit de Th. Reinach un coup d'œil hâtif, le Maître a lu *en fuite sur Comana*, là où l'archéologue avait écrit *avant de quitter Comana*. D'autre part, il rectifie soigneusement Plutarque, qui fait de Monime une Milésienne, pour adopter l'opinion de Th. Reinach, qui la fait naître à Stratonicee.

Il n'a garde d'oublier la fière résistance de la Grecque aux sollicitations du roi, et c'est encore de Plutarque qu'il s'inspire, d'assez loin il est vrai :

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 716. Monime avait refusé quinze mille pièces d'or dont Mithridate croyait l'acheter. Il fallut que le roi de Pont lui envoyât le bandeau royal. C'était d'ailleurs un présent qui coûtait peu à ce grand faiseur de reines.

PLUTARQUE, *Lucullus*

P. 115. Ceste cy [Monime] estoit fort renommée entre les Grecs, pource que quelques sollicitations que lui sceust faire le roi en estant amoureux, et qu'il luy eust envoyé quinze mille escus comptans, jamais ne voulut entendre à toutes ses poursuites, jusqu'à ce qu'il y eust accord de mariage passé entre eulx, qu'il luy eust envoyé le diadème ou bandeau royal, et qu'il l'eust appelée roïne.

Dans le paragraphe suivant, il abandonne brusquement la *Vie de Lucullus* pour nous donner, sur le tempérament de la reine, des aperçus inattendus :

On trouva plus tard, dans les archives du Château neuf, près Cabira, une correspondance échangée entre Monime et Mithridate, dont le ton licencieux choqua la pudeur des Romains.<sup>1</sup>

Ce n'est point sous ce jour lascif que Racine nous présente sa Monime; mais Plutarque, dans sa *Vie de Pompée*, signale bien ces lettres ardentes :

En un autre château nommé Caenon, il [Pompée] trouva quelques papiers et quelques missives secrettes de Mithridates. ... Il y avoit ... des lettres lascives d'amour, de Monime à luy, et de luy à elle. ...<sup>2</sup>

Il est peu probable que notre érudit ait retrouvé et consulté ce texte : il ne l'a vraisemblablement connu qu'à travers quelques lignes de Th. Reinach :

Le roi la rencontra [Monime] en 88, probablement après le sac de sa ville natale. Il offrit à la belle Grecque 15 000 pièces d'or; mais la femme résista mieux que la forteresse et le roi dut passer par ses conditions. ... La passion de Mithridate persista longtemps : au *Château-Neuf*, Pompée découvrit toute une correspondance amoureuse échangée entre Mithridate et Monime, dont le ton

<sup>1</sup> *Vie lit.*, IV, 716.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarque, VI, 183.

était même assez *licencieux*. Cela n'empêcha pas la belle Monime d'être traitée à l'égal des autres femmes de Mithridate et de vivre enfermée dans le gynécée.<sup>1</sup>

Notre bon Maître, qui goûtait si fort les héroïnes de Racine parce qu'elles étaient "de véritables femmes," qui avaient "des sens et cette chaleur intime que nous appelons l'âme,"<sup>2</sup> ne pouvait manquer de recueillir un tel témoignage, et non content d'emprunter à l'archéologue le détail des faits, il s'approprie jusqu'à ses expressions.<sup>3</sup>

Après quoi, il reprend le fil du récit de Plutarque, qu'il résume impitoyablement, et, pour expliquer peut-être cette ardeur lascive, il insiste sur le long ennui et les désillusions de Monime:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 716. Mais enfermée *loin de la Grèce*, dans un sérail, *sous la garde de soldats barbares*, la fière Ionienne regrettait amèrement sa patrie et sa liberté.

PLUTARQUE, *Lucullus*

P. 115. La pauvre dame tout le temps auparavant depuis que ce roy Barbare l'eut espousée, avoit vescu en grande desplaisance, ne faisant continuellement autre chose que de plorer la malheureuse beaulté de son corps, laquelle au lieu d'un mary luy avoit donné un maistre, et au lieu de compagnie conjugale et que doit avoir une dame d'honneur, luy avoit baillé *une garde et garnison d'hommes Barbares*, qui la tenoyent comme prisonnière, *loing du doux pais de la Grèce*.

Abondant, avec l'arrivée de Bacchidès, le récit du drame proprement dit, il reproduit fidèlement la substance d'une phrase de Plutarque:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 716. Bacchidès portait aux femmes l'ordre de mourir de la manière que chacune d'elles croirait la plus prompte et la moins douloureuse.

PLUTARQUE, *Lucullus*

P. 116. Quand ce Bacchilides fut arrivé devers elles, et leur eust fait commandement de par le roy qu'elles eussent à élire *la manière de mourir*, qui leur sembleroit à chascune plus aisée et la moins douloureuse, elle [Monime] s'arracha d'alentour de la teste son bandeau royal ...

<sup>1</sup> Th. Reinach, *op. cit.*, p. 296. La note 4, même page, renvoie à la *Vie de Pompée*.

<sup>2</sup> A. France, *Le Petit Pierre* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1918), p. 331. Sur la profonde et persistante influence de Racine sur A. France, cf. G. Des Hons, *Anatole France et Racine* (Paris: Le Divan, 1925).

<sup>3</sup> La position du Château-Neuf par rapport à Cabira est indiquée par Reinach, *op. cit.*, p. 290: "Le Château-Neuf, à 200 stades de Cabira ... renfermait les archives du roi, sa correspondance secrète." Cf. *ibid.*, p. 418.

Plutarque, comme on peut le voir, commençait alors le récit de la mort de Monime. A. France, qui veut réserver Monime pour la fin, s'écarte de son modèle, et raconte d'abord la mort de Bérénice et de sa mère; mais trouvant sans doute la description de cette double agonie un peu lente chez Plutarque, il a recours à M. Reinach:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 716. Bérénice se fit apporter *une coupe de poison*. Sa mère, qui était près d'elle, lui demanda de la *partager*. Elles burent toutes les deux. La mère mourut la première. Et, comme Bérénice *se tortait dans une horrible agonie*, Bacchidès l'acheva en l'étouffant.

TH. REINACH, *Mithridate*

P. 341. Bérénice de Chios, une de ses concubines, *partagea une coupe empoisonnée* avec sa mère; la vieille femme expira sur le champ, mais la fille *se tortait* encore dans les spasmes de l'agonie quand Bacchidès, pour en finir, l'étouffa.

Il décrit ensuite la mort plus pathétique de Roxane et de Statira, non sans commettre une curieuse erreur, qui lui fait prêter à Roxane la fière et digne attitude de Statira. Peut-être était-il hanté par la magie racinienne de ce nom de Roxane? Mais, de Roxane et de Statira, Th. Reinach n'avait dit que quelques mots, et A. France revient à Plutarque:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 716. Roxane et Statira choisirent aussi le poison. La première le prit *en maudissant son frère*. Mais Roxane, au contraire, le loua de ce qu'au milieu des dangers qu'il courait *lui-même il ne les avait pas oubliées*, et leur avait assuré une mort libre, *abritée des outrages*.

PLUTARQUE, *Lucullus*

P. 117. Quant aux deux soeurs qui n'estoyent point mariées, on dit que l'une beut aussi du poison *en maudissant* et detestant fort la cruauté de son frère, mais que Statira ne dit jamais une mauvaise parole, ne qui sentist son coeur failly, ou ayant regret de mourir, *ains au contraire qu'elle loua et remercia son frère de ce que se voyant en danger de sa personne, il ne les avoit point oubliées*, *ains avoit eu le soing de les faire mourir avant qu'elles tombassent entre les mains des ennemis, et premier qu'ils peussent faire aucun outrage à leur honneur*.

Reste le plus émouvant: la fin de celle que Racine devait élire "entre les femmes que Mithridate a aimées." C'est encore Plutarque qui est mis à contribution pour le détail de la scène aussi bien que pour plusieurs expressions:

A. FRANCE, *Vie lit.*, IV

P. 716. Monime, en mémoire peut-être des reines tragiques de ses poètes, détacha de son front le bandeau royal, le noua autour de son cou, et se pendit, comme Phèdre, à une cheville de la chambre. Mais le faible tissu se rompit.

Plutarque a conservé ou trouvé les douloureuses paroles que, selon lui, prononça la jeune femme: "*Fatal diadème, s'écria-t-elle, tu ne me rendras pas même ce service!*" Et elle présenta la gorge à l'eunuque. Ainsi périt, après de longs dégoûts, dans le sérail de Pharnace, Monime de Stratonice.

PLUTARQUE, *Lucullus*

P. 116. Elle s'arracha d'alentour de la teste son bandeau royal, et se le nouant à l'entour du col s'en pendit, mais le bandeau ne fut pas assez fort et se rompit incontinent et lors elle se prit à dire: "O maudit et malheureux tissu ne me serviras-tu point au moins à ce triste service" en disant ces paroles elle le jeta contre terre crachant dessus, et tendit la gorge à Bacchilides pour la luy couper.

Mais comment l'homme qui, dans le *Temps* du 13 avril 1890, professe pour Jean Racine "une admiration fidèle et tendre," qui affirme l'aimer "de [son] cœur et de [son] âme, peut-être même de [sa] chair et de [son] sang," qui, "le sachant par cœur et le relisant encore, lui demande presque chaque jour le secret des justes pensées et des paroles limpides,"<sup>1</sup> pourrait-il ne pas entendre chanter en lui, en parlant de Monime, l'écho des vers raciniens:

Et toi, fatal tissu, malheureux diadème,  
Instrument et témoin de toutes mes douleurs,  
Bandeau, que mille fois j'ai trempé de mes pleurs,  
Au moins, en terminant ma vie et mon supplice,  
Ne pouvois-tu me rendre un funeste service?<sup>2</sup>

Les douloureuses paroles que Plutarque rapporte, c'est à travers Racine qu'A. France les entend; et c'est le souvenir racinien qui lui permet de répandre, sur ce drame rapide de volupté et de mort, un indéfinissable pathétique auquel le vieux conteur n'atteignait pas.<sup>3</sup>

Mais que les prestiges du conteur ne nous fassent pas oublier les défaillances du critique: rien qui aille au cœur de l'œuvre; une fantaisie qui voltige sur quelques chapitres, respire quelques pages,

<sup>1</sup> A. France, "Auguste Vacquerie," *Vie lit.*, III, 345.

<sup>2</sup> Racine, *Mithridate*, acte V, sc. I.

<sup>3</sup> Il est permis de supposer que c'est dans la préface de *Mithridate* qu'A. France a relu d'abord le récit de Plutarque traduit par Amyot; c'est Racine, en tout cas, qui lui a donné, semble-t-il, l'idée de certains remanements. Cf. Amyot, p. 116: "tendit la gorge à Bacchilides pour la luy couper"; Amyot, cité par Racine, préface de *Mithridate*, p. 20: "tendit la gorge à l'eunuque"; A. France, *Vie lit.*, IV, p. 716: "présenta la gorge à l'eunuque." Mais, pour tout ce qui a trait à la mort de Bérénice, de Roxane, et de Statira, A. France dut se reporter au texte complet.

recueille quelques phrases, et compose du tout un miel plaisant, mais peu substantifique.

Ne nous a-t-il pas prévenus? "La critique, a-t-il répété, est comme la philosophie et l'histoire, une espèce de roman à l'usage des esprits avisés et curieux, et tout roman, à le bien prendre, est une autobiographie. Le bon critique est celui qui raconte les aventures de son âme au milieu des chefs-d'œuvre."<sup>1</sup> Ne nous plaignons pas: nous y gagnons, disent de bonnes âmes, force remarques ingénieuses et profondes. A merveille: encore voudrions-nous bien n'être pas tout à fait dupes: notre bon Maître oublie si aisément les guillemets.

Il professait même à cet égard, s'il faut en croire J.-J. Brousson, des opinions particulières: "Quand une chose a été dite et bien dite, confiait-il à son fidèle secrétaire, n'ayez aucun scrupule, prenez-la, copiez. Donner des références? A quoi bon? Ou bien vos lecteurs savent où vous avez cueilli le passage et la précaution est inutile, ou bien ils l'ignorent, et vous les humiliez."<sup>2</sup> Simple boutade, dira-t-on: s'il est vrai qu'il s'approprie des idées et des faits, il les présente toujours sous une forme bien à lui. Que non pas: souvent ses ciseaux ingénieux se bornent à découper des phrases, des expressions, des mots; ils sont parfois même trop paresseux pour élaguer les pauvretés et les platitudes. Il retaille, il rajuste, il recolle. "Mes instruments de travail les plus précieux, avoue-t-il: la colle et les ciseaux."<sup>3</sup>

Mais aussi, diront encore nos bonnes âmes, quel trésor d'érudition! Certes, les doctes propos de M. France, comme les diamants de M. d'Astarac, "ont un air de vérité"; mais il n'y faut point regarder de trop près. Ce "bénédictin" est parfois distrait: il lui arrive de confondre des noms, des lieux, des dates, d'inventer un dieu inédit; et que penser aussi de ce critique qui s'empare de la thèse fondamentale d'un ouvrage pour en accabler l'auteur même? Etrange distraction, et comment désormais le croire sur parole?

Ces deux articles de la *Vie littéraire* deviennent plus révélateurs encore si nous les confrontons avec le passage du *Mannequin d'osier* qu'ils ont inspiré.

<sup>1</sup> *Le Temps*, 25 mars 1888; *Vie lit.*, II, 491; cf. *Vie lit.*, I, 5, "Préface à A. Hébrard."

<sup>2</sup> J.-J. Brousson, *Anatole France en pantoufles* (Paris: Crès, 1924), p. 49. Cf. A. France, "Apologie pour le plagiat," *Vie lit.*, IV, 532-40, 541-50.

<sup>3</sup> J.-J. Brousson, *op. cit.*, p. 78.



Dépourvu d'imagination créatrice, A. France, on l'a maintes fois répété, possède au plus haut degré l'imagination qui rapproche, combine, et refond. La plupart du temps, c'est à autrui qu'il emprunte les matériaux de ses patientes synthèses; souvent aussi, comme Chateaubriand, c'est à son propre fonds qu'il puise, à ses ébauches ou à ses emprunts antérieurs. Une première transcription ne lui permet pas d'atteindre à l'originalité; mais retrouvant dans ses réserves, au bout de quelques années, ces matériaux déjà à demi-dégrossis, il les retaille, les repolit, les rassemble, et parvient à en faire un tout harmonieux, qui porte, cette fois, la marque inimitable.

Suivons les étapes de cette élaboration. L'article sur *Les criminels* est de mars 1888; l'article sur *Mithridate Eupator*, d'août 1891. Ils précèdent l'un et l'autre de plusieurs années la page du *Mannequin d'osier*, publiée pour la première fois en mars 1897: lequel lui a servi de point de départ?

L'ouvrage de Reinach, si estimable qu'il soit, ne dut pas agiter longtemps l'opinion publique; la popularité de Lombroso, au contraire, alla croissant. "M. Cesare Lombroso, lisons-nous dans *le Temps* du 10 juillet 1895, est assurément aujourd'hui un des hommes les plus connus de l'Europe, de Saint-Petersbourg à Paris, de Constantinople à Dublin; les journaux font mention de son nom et citent couramment quelques unes de ses théories les plus considérables. ... Peu s'en faut que sa popularité n'égale celle du comte Tolstoi, qui continue cependant à "détenir le record" de la célébrité européenne. ..."<sup>1</sup>

La criminologie reste à l'ordre du jour: ne nous étonnons pas que l'affaire de la maison de la reine Marguerite revienne plusieurs fois au cours des deux premiers volumes de l'*Histoire contemporaine*, et qu'un chapitre du *Mannequin d'osier* soit consacré à la discussion du cas de l'assassin Lecœur en particulier, et du criminel-né en général, avec force considérations sur la responsabilité, les prisons, et la peine de mort. C'est une question dont A. France semble fort occupé, et c'est à ce thème général qu'il rattachera accessoirement l'exemple singulier de la fille de Mithridate.

C'est d'abord à son propre article sur *Les Criminels* qu'A. France

<sup>1</sup> *Le Temps*, 10 juillet 1895; reproduit dans les *Archives d'anthropologie criminelle*, X (1895), 623.

songea sans doute lorsqu'il voulut prêter au docteur Fornerol quelques notions de criminologie; mais il est certain qu'en écrivant il avait aussi sous les yeux *l'Homme criminel* même, puisque nous reconnaissons dans les propos du docteur des arguments qui ne figurent point dans l'article de 1888, mais se trouvent en revanche dans la *Préface* de Ch. Létourneau ou dans le texte de Lombroso, et en particulier les remarques sur la sensibilité obtuse, les tatouages obscènes, et la denture anormale des criminels.<sup>1</sup>

Il semble que ce soit la découverte de ce dernier stigmate criminel qui ait éveillé alors chez A. France le souvenir de la monstrueuse difformité de Drypétina, et l'ait amené à exhumer l'article sur *Mithridate Eupator*. L'auteur du *Mannequin* veut-il souffler à M. Bergeret une docte objection, anachronique et naïve, les pages élaborées naguère par le critique du *Temps* s'offrent à lui dégagées de leurs sources et affranchies de toute contrainte historique. Il y puise à son gré, sans autre souci que de combiner un personnage irréel, mais touchant, que M. Bergeret évoquera en des termes d'une solennité universitaire et d'une émotion racinienne. Qu'importent alors les défaillances du critique et les caprices du romancier, pourvu que ce propos classique fasse avec le reste de l'entretien le plus savoureux contraste, et s'accorde avec l'âme professorale et sensible du Maître de conférences de littérature latine à la Faculté des lettres.

Mais la Faculté pardonnera-t-elle jamais à M. Bergeret l'inexpiable crime d'avoir manqué de méthode et défiguré des textes vénérables?

ROBERT VIGNERON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. France, *Le Mannequin d'osier*, p. 355: "Comme beaucoup de criminels de naissance, il ne jouit que d'une sensibilité obtuse. ... Il est tatoué sur tout le corps. Et l'on est surpris de la fantaisie lubrique qui détermina le choix des scènes et des attributs tatoués sur la peau"; Ch. Létourneau, *Préface*, pp. iv et v: "Toutes les variétés de la sensibilité sont, chez eux [les criminels] plus obtuses. ... Les criminels ont un sif et précoce amour pour le tatouage, qui est souvent cynique et pratiqué même sur les organes sexuels"; Lombroso, *Homme criminel*, p. 271: "Un autre caractère des criminels ... est de se tracer des dessins, non seulement aux bras et à la poitrine ... mais sur presque toutes les parties du corps"; *ibid.*, pp. 268 et 290. Sur la denture anormale des criminels, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 171, 230, 239.

## CERTAIN OLD NORSE SUFFIXES

### I. THE SUFFIX *-(n)eskja*

**I**N OLD NORSE we have a suffix *-(n)eskja*, generally denoting an abstract idea; cf. *forn-eskja*, 'antiquity'; *vitn-eskja*, 'intelligence,' 'information'; *hard-eskja*, 'hardness,' 'harshness.' Sometimes, however, this suffix denotes a purely concrete idea signifying something which has 'the nature or characteristics' of the stem to which the suffix is attached; cf. *mann-eskja*, 'someone who is human,' 'a human being,' 'man'; *flat-eskja*, 'something which is flat,' 'a flat piece of land,' 'a plain.'

It is clear that the *n* in the suffix *-n-eskja* (as in *hard-eskja*, *flat-eskja*) has been abstracted<sup>1</sup> from substantive stems ending in *-n* (cf. *for-eskja*, *vit-eskja*, *man-eskja*), so that we are here concerned only with the origin of the suffix *-eskja*.

The suffix *-eskja* has been traditionally derived from a PG *\*-iskjôn*.<sup>2</sup> My purpose here is to show that the suffix *-eskja* is not derived directly from a PG *\*-iskjôn* but represents a secondary formation due to the example of the adjectives in *-esk* < *\*-isk*.

In the first place, if these substantives in *-eskja* had been derived from the stem *forn* : *vitn* : *mann* - plus the suffix *\*-iskjôn*, the resultant forms would have been *\*fyrn-skja* : *\*vitn-skja* : *\*menn-skja*. Since these stems are all long and monosyllabic, there is absolutely no reason for assuming that the *i* of the suffix *\*-iskjôn* would not have disappeared with resultant *i*-umlaut of the radical vowel just exactly as in the case of the suffix *\*-i-skôn*; cf. *\*barn-i-skôn* > *bern-ska*, 'childishness'; *\*trull-i-skôn* > *tryll-ska*, 'witchery'; *\*mann-i-skôn* > *menn-ska*, 'humanity.' The presence of the vowel *e* in the suffix *-e-skja* and the fact that the radical vowel in *f-o-rn-eskja* and *m-a-nn-eskja* was exempted from the *i*-umlaut are sufficient proof that the suffix *-eskja* is of secondary origin, added to the stem *forn* - (adj. 'old') : *mann* - (subst. 'man').

<sup>1</sup> With this abstraction of *-n* (from the stem syllable) in *-n-eskja* cf. *jafn-adr*, *fagn-adr*; *fé-nadr*, *her-nadr*, and *brotn-ing* (from the verb *brotna*): *smur-ning*; *tam-ning*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. F. Kluge, *Nominale Stammbildungslehre*, § 160; F. Holthausen, *Aisl. Elementarbuch*, § 330, 12.

Second, since substantives in *-ska* are derived from adjectives in *-sk-* it is reasonable to assume that according to this pattern substantives in *-eskja* are derived from adjectives in *-esk-*. There must have been some reason why the substantives in *-eskja* did not undergo the regular phonetic process but instead were subject to a secondary analogical transference of the adjectival suffix *-esk-* plus the substantive ending *-ja*, and it is to this point that we now come.

It must be noted that all the stems to which the substantive suffix *-eskja* was attached end in *-n*; cf. *for-n-eskja*:*vit-n-eskja*:*man-n-eskja*:*bar-n-eskja*:*lik-n-eskja*. Similarly, all the stems to which the adjectival suffix *-esk-* was attached end in *-n*; cf. *got-n-eskr*, 'Gothic'; *frakk-n-eskr*, 'Frankish'; *sax-n-eskr*, 'Saxon'; *him-n-eskr*, 'heavenly'; *heid-n-eskr*, 'heathen.' The evident conclusion is that by virtue of the final *-n* of the stem the suffix *-esk* in these substantives was through force of analogy borrowed from the adjectives in *-esk-*, resulting in a new substantive formation in *-eskja* parallel to the older regular formation in *-ska*. The adjectives in *-esk-* constitute a comparatively small group, and for this reason the suffix *-esk-* came to be felt as belonging only to stems ending in *-n*.

It must be noted that the suffix *-esk-* was attached only to stems of two syllables, the stem syllable *gotn-*, *frakkn-*, *saxn-*, *himn-*, and *heidn-* representing an earlier *\*got-an-*, *\*frakk-an-*, *\*sax-an-*, *\*him-in-*, *\*heid-in-*. According to the law of vowel syncope in unstressed syllables<sup>1</sup> the suffix *\*-isk-* survived as *-esk-*, without *i*-umlaut of the radical vowel because of the intervening syllable; cf. *\*got-an-isk-aR* > *gotn-eskr*, etc.

On the other hand, the suffix *-sk-* was attached to stems of one<sup>2</sup> syllable, whereby the *i* of the suffix *\*-isk-* was lost but with resultant *i*-umlaut;<sup>3</sup> cf. *\*furn-isk-a* > *fyrn-ska*. But because of the final *-n* of the stem these monosyllabic stems, *for-n-*, *vit-n-*, *man-n-*, *bar-n-*, *lik-n-*, took on the suffix *-eskja* after the pattern of the adjectives in *-esk-* (whose stems ended in *-n*) without umlaut of the radical vowel;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Heusler, *Aisl. Elementarb.*, § 110a: "War der Vokal in Ultima 'unfest,' d. i. synkopierbar gemäss § 105, dann blieb er in Pänultima, schwand in Antepänultima." With *\*got-an-esk-aR* > *gotn-eskr* cf. *\*mi-ki-lu-mu* > *mik-lum*.

<sup>2</sup> Also to stems of two syllables in case the vowel of the second syllable was not apocopated; cf. *\*is-land-isk-aR* > *islen-eskr*.

<sup>3</sup> This applies only to long monosyllabic stems, such as are under consideration. After short monosyllabic stems the *i* disappeared regularly without producing umlaut; cf. *\*dan-isk-aR* > *danskr* (cf. Heusler, *op.cit.*, § 68). The adjective *elskr* < *\*al-isk-aR* is an exception, due possibly to the example of the long stems, such as *berneskr*, *menneskr*, etc.

cf. *f-o-rn-eskja* with *g-o-tn-eskr*, *vitn-eskja* with *himn-eskr*, *m-a-nn-eskja* with *s-a-xn-eskr*.

Although the suffixes *-sk-* and *-esk-* were both derived from *\*-isk-*, differentiation in the sense of the suffixes *-ska* and *-eskja* ensued.

The substantives in *-ska* are restricted in sense to a purely abstract idea, whereas the substantives in *-eskja* imply besides the abstract idea a notion designating that which is 'characteristic of.' The following examples of substantives in *-ska* and in *-eskja*, both derived from the same stem, will serve to illustrate the point in question.

1. *Fyrn-ska*, 'age' (abstract): *forn-eskja*, 'that which is characteristic of the old age' > 'heathendom' > 'sorcery' (cf. *forn-eskju-maðr*, 'sorcerer').

2. *Vit-ska*, 'wisdom,' 'knowledge' (abstract): *vitn-eskja*, 'having testimony (*vitni*) of a thing' > 'information, intelligence' (i.e., 'knowledge of a particular thing') > 'a sign,' 'signal' (i.e., 'something which gives information').

3. *Menn-ska*, 'humanity': *mann-eskja*,<sup>1</sup> 'a human being,' i.e., 'a being who has human (*mann-*) characteristics as contrasted with the divine.'

This semantic differentiation evidently grew out of the fact that the comparatively few adjectives in *-esk-* denoted aside from the idea of origin also the notion 'characteristic of.' The adjectives denoting nationality, such as *gotn-eskr*, *frakkn-eskr*, *saxn-eskr*, could all imply the characteristics of those nations; cf. Ger. 'Er ist sehr deutsch.' Similarly the adjective *himn-eskr*, 'heavenly,' denotes that which is characteristic of heaven; cf. *jard-neskr*, 'earthly' (as opposed to 'heavenly'). By force of association with *himn-eskr* the monosyllabic stem *jard-* took on the suffix *-(n)-esk* without suffering *i*-umlaut. The regular form *\*ird-skr* (< *\*erd-isk-aR*) would have meant 'earthy,' 'of earth,' but not 'characteristic of earth' (as opposed to 'heaven').

In the case of *mann-eskja*, 'human being,' the notion 'characteristic of' has entirely prevailed over the abstract idea, and similarly in *flat-neskja*, 'a flat piece of land,' and in *lik-neskja*, 'shape,' 'image,' 'likeness.' The form *mann-eskja* is evidently of late origin since it is

<sup>1</sup> The modern Scandinavian forms Norw.-Dan. *menn-eske*, Norw. (dial.) *menn-eskja*, Swed. *männ-iska*: *männ-ska*, as the presence of the *i*-umlaut shows, are not derived from ON *mann-eskja* but are loaned from WGer. (cf. Falk and Torp, *Norw.-Dän. Etym. Wtb.*, I, 714, under *menneke*).

found only in the (later) ecclesiastical writers. The reason for this is obvious. The old word for 'human being,' namely, *maðr* or *mennskr maðr*, was used to designate 'man' as distinguished from supernatural creatures, such as trolls, giants, etc. The new word *mann-eskja* was therefore utilized by ecclesiastical writers to distinguish the human from the divine nature, especially since the word *maðr* or *mennskr maðr* did not imply this distinction.

Of these five substantives in *-eskja* none occurs in the poetry of the Elder Edda and only *forn-eskja* is recorded by Larsson (*Ordför-rådet i de äldsta isländska handskrifterna*).<sup>1</sup> Apparently, then, the suffix *-eskja* first came into being in the word *forn-eskja*. If this assumption be correct, then we have conclusive proof that all these substantives in *-eskja* were of late origin, inasmuch as the word *forn-eskja*, which has reference to the heathen age as opposed to Christianity, could hardly have existed before the time of the introduction of Christianity (1000 A.D.). This evidence is in keeping with my hypothesis that the suffix *-eskja* is of secondary and therefore of late origin. On the other hand, the corresponding substantives in *-ska* (*fyrn-ska*, *vit-ska*, and *menn-ska*) are all recorded by Larsson; which fact is in keeping with their primary PG origin.

## II. THE SUFFIX *-und*

The suffix *-und* serves to designate both abstract and concrete ideas; cf. abstract *vit-und*, 'knowledge,' 'consciousness,' 'intelligence'; *nó-nd* (< *\*ná-und*), 'vicinity,' 'proximity,' and concrete *tí-und*, 'a tithe'; *átt-und*, 'an eighth part'; *tig-und*, 'a kind,' 'species'; *hór-und*, 'flesh,' 'skin.'

This suffix *-und* evidently has two different origins, namely, (1) as representing the present participial suffix *-und* and (2) *-und* as abstracted from the ordinal numerals. The suffix *-und* in the abstract substantives *vit-und* and *nó-und* represents the former category, while the suffix *-und* in *tí-und* and *átt-und*, and probably also in *tig-und* and *hór-und*, represents the latter category.

### 1. The suffix *-und* in the feminine abstracts *vit-und*, 'knowledge,'

<sup>1</sup> Larsson, however, records the forms *lík-neske* (neut.) and *barn-éðsca* (fem.). The form *lík-neske* (neut. *ja*-stem) must be explained in the same way as *lík-neskja*, but the suffix *-éðsca* (= *aska*) in *barn-éðsca* (= *barn-aska*) is of entirely different origin, i.e., < *\*-ðr-iskó* < *\*-ðhir-iskón*; cf. *þri* < Goth. *jáhisa*, 'younger'; cf. *aska*, 'youth.'

and *nþ-nd* (<\**nd-und*), 'proximity,' represents an ablaut variation<sup>1</sup> of *-and*, the present participial suffix. This ablaut variation was an IE inheritance, preserved not only in ON but also in the other Germanic languages; cf. Goth. *hul-und-i* (fem.), 'that which conceals' > 'cave' (cf. Goth. *hul-jan*: ON *hyl-ja*, 'conceal'); ON *heft-andi*: *hǫf-und-r* subst., 'author'; ON *Borg-und* (Latinized *Burg-und-[i]ones*; cf. ON *borg*); Goth. *nehw-und-ja*, 'neighbor,' with which we must connect ON *nþ-nd* < \**nd-und* (cf. OHG *nāh-unt*<sup>2</sup> [adv.], 'near').

The suffix *-und* in *vit-und* is obviously of primary origin, being added to the verbal stem *vit-*, 'to know.' The suffix *-und* in *nþ-nd*, on the other hand, is most likely of secondary origin, being added to the adjectival stem *nā-*, 'near,' after the pattern of the present participial formations; cf. OHG *leid-unt* (fem.), 'Anklage,' 'Leidwesen,' with adjectival stem *leid-* (subst. *leid*, vb. *leid-ēn*). The suffix *-und*, being of verbal origin (cf. *vit-und*, 'knowing something' > 'knowledge'), added to the adjectival stem the idea of 'being'; i.e., \**nd-und* > *nþ-nd* = 'being near' > 'proximity' = OHG *nāh-unt* (cf. ON *nā-vist*, 'being near' > 'presence' = OHG *nāh-uuist*); cf. OHG *leid-unt*, 'being in a state of woe' > 'woe,' etc.

Characteristic of this present participial suffix *-und* over against the suffix *-und* denoting concrete ideas is the variation of the radical vowel; cf. *vit-und*: *-and*: *-end*: *-ind*. Since the vowel *u* of this suffix does not vary in the other Germanic languages, we may conclude that this variation in ON is a secondary development due to the influence of the substantivized present participle in \*-*ēn*; cf. *hyggj-and-i*: *-end-i*: *hygg-indi*,<sup>3</sup> 'thought,' 'wisdom' (cf. also *vit-and-i* [pres. part.], 'knowing').

2. There can be no doubt that the forms *tí-und*, 'a tenth part,' 'tithe,' and *átí-und*, 'an eighth part,' represent a (fem.) substantiviza-

<sup>1</sup> For this question see Noreen, *Aisl Gramm.*, § 539, 2; F. Dieter, *Laut- und Formenlehre der altgerm. Dialekte*, § 205a, p. 376; F. Kluge, *Urgerm.*, § 180a, Anm. 1.

<sup>2</sup> A. Fick (Vgl. *Wb. der Indogerm. Sprachen*, p. 290, under *nēhwa*) identifies the *-t* in OHG *nāh-unt* (adv.) 'near' and the *-d* in Goth. *nehwun-d-ja* with the adverbial suffix *-d* as in Goth. *jain-d*. But the adverbial force of OHG *nāh-unt* was secondary, growing out of the substantive usage; cf. Goth. *flu* subs. > adv. Furthermore, Fick leaves unexplained the vowel *u* of the suffix syllable.

The ON form *nānd* (without *u*-umlaut) alongside the form *nþnd* may be explained as due to association with the syllable *nā-* in *nā-inn* and compounds.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Noreen, *op. cit.*, § 173, 2.



tion of the ordinal numerals<sup>1</sup> *tt-und-i*, 'tenth,' and *dtl-and-i:øtt-undi*, 'eighth.'

The fact that the substantive *dtl-und* has the suffix *-und* instead of *-and* (<*dtl-and-i*) is probably directly due to the influence of the substantive *tt-und*, although the suffix *-und* in the ordinals *sia-und-i: si-und-i*, 'seventh,' and *nt-und-i*, 'ninth,' may also have been a contributing factor in favor of *-und* instead of *-and*. The absence of the *u*-umlaut in *dtl-und* (instead of *\*øtt-und*) may be explained as due to association with the cardinal *dtla*, 'eight'; cf. *dtl-ungr*, 'eighth part.'

In these substantivized ordinals *ttund* and *dtlund* only the final *-d* < *\*ð* represents an original suffix, the syllable *-un-* belonging to the cardinal stem, i.e., *tt-un-d*, *dtl-un-d*.<sup>2</sup> In course of time, however, the syllable *-und* became felt as a suffix denoting 'a part of something,' 'that which belongs to something,' and consequently became transferred to stems other than numeral.

I believe that this suffix *-und* is present both in *tig-und*, 'species,' 'kind,' and in *hqr-und*, 'flesh,' 'skin,' although the latter case is far less clear because of the uncertainty as to the origin of the stem syllable *hqr-*.

The stem *tig-* means 'pointed out,' 'distinguished' (cf. *tig-inn*, 'illustrious'); *tig-und* (fem.) (later *teg-und*; cf. *tega* = *tjá* < *\*tthan*) could then have signified 'that which belongs to something as distinct (*tig-*, 'pointed out') from other things' > 'a kind,' 'species.'

If the suffix *-und* in *tig-und* were identical with the present participial formation we should not have expected the root *tig-* but *tth-*, i.e., *\*tjd-und* > *\*tjðnd*, and we should furthermore have expected an active sense 'distinguishing' > 'making distinct' rather than a passive sense 'something made distinct'; cf. *vit-und*, 'knowing something' > 'knowledge.'

The etymology of the word *hqr-und*, 'flesh,' 'skin,' is doubtful. Fick<sup>3</sup> derives it from a stem *\*haran-* which he connects with Lat. *caro* and an IE root (*s*)*ker*, 'to cut.' If ON *hqr-und* is derived from PG *\*haran-*, how are we to account for the vowel *u* and the final *-d*? Does the syllable *-und* represent a present participial formation?

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Falk and Torp. *op. cit.*, II, 1258, under *tiende*.

<sup>2</sup> The *-n* in *dtl-un-* (< *dtla* < Goth. *ahtau*, Lat. *octo*) is due to analogy with the other ordinals in *-n*, *si-und-i*, *nt-und-i*, *tt-und-i*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 77, under *harunda*: "Von einem Stamme *haran-* abgeleitet. Vgl. lat. *caro* m. Fleisch. Wz. (*s*)*ker* schneiden (?)."'

In the first place, the meaning of the word, i.e., 'flesh,' 'skin,' is not consonant with a present participial formation, for, as shown above, this formation with a transitive verb has an active force. In this case the word would have originally signified 'something which cuts' instead of 'something cut' > 'flesh' (Lat. *caro*);<sup>1</sup> cf. Goth. *hul-und-i* (< *hul-jan*), 'that which conceals' > 'cave.'

Again, if the stem syllable *hqr-* goes back to Lat. *car-[o]*, then the final syllable *-und* cannot be identical with the suffix *-und* as in *ti-und*, inasmuch as this suffix here could have no sense; the word *hqr-und* could not have originally signified 'belonging to, a part of, the flesh.'

I propose here an entirely different etymology from that offered by Fick.

I refer the stem syllable *hqr-* to the root \**hazwa*->ON *hqr-r*, OHG *haro*, 'flax.' This word is connected with the IE root \**kes*,<sup>2</sup> 'to comb' and evidently originally signified 'that which was combed.' Connected with this same root is ON *hár*,<sup>3</sup> OHG *hâr*, 'hair'; ON *haddr*: OE *heord*, 'hair on a woman's head.'

There is no reason, therefore, why we may not assume that the syllable *hqr-* in *hqr-und* meant 'hair'; a semantic parallel is Ger. *Flachs*, Eng. *flax*: Ger. *flechten*, 'to weave'; *Flechte*, 'a braid of hair.'

If we assume the suffix *-und* in *hqr-und* to be identical with the suffix *-und* in *ti-und*: *tig-und*, then the word could have signified 'belonging to, a part of, the hair' > 'skin,' 'flesh.' The hair of the body grows out from the skin or flesh, and thus the semantic connection between hair and skin or flesh is not beyond the range of possibility; cf. Lat. *caput*, 'head': *capillus*, 'thing pertaining to the head' > 'hair.'

The substantive *hqr-und* is both feminine and neuter gender without any apparent distinction in meaning, but there is nothing to prevent our assuming that the word was originally feminine gender and that the shift in gender was due to the influence of the synonymous neuters *skinn*, 'skin,' and *hold*, 'flesh.'

That the words *hqr-und* and *tig-und* represent later formations is

<sup>1</sup> The original active sense of the transitive verb, however, could have become passive in the verbal substantive, since verbal substantives (cf. the infinitive) have no voice. The substantive \**har-und-i* (fem.) could then have signified 'a cutting (of flesh)' > 'flesh.' But, as I show later on, the word *hqrund* is not found until a comparatively late period, which fact militates against the assumption of a primary suffix *-und*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Falk and Torp, *op. cit.*, I, 454, under *hþr*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 369, under *haar*.

supported by the fact that neither one of these words occurs in the poetry of the Elder Edda nor is either one of them recorded by Larsson (*op. cit.*). For *hpr-und* we find in the poetry of the Elder Edda the older words *skinn* (*Rigsþ.*, VIII, 1) and *hold* (*Hávm.*, XCVI, 3; *Vkv.*, XII, 3, etc.) and for *tig-und* the older word *kynni* (*HHv.*, III, 4; *Am.*, XIII, 1); cf. Eng. *kind* < OE (*ge*)*cynd*, Lat. *genus*.

### III. THE SUFFIX *-aldi*

The suffix *-aldi* implies a derogative sense, referring to persons having certain undesirable characteristics; cf. *glóþ-aldi*, 'idiot' (*glóþ-r*, 'idiot'; *glóþ-ska*, 'idiocy,' 'foolishness'); *digr-aldi*, 'fat person' (*digr*, 'fat'); *þumb-aldi*, 'dull moper' (*þumb-ast*, 'to mope'; *þumb-ara-ligr*, 'moping'); *hím-aldi*, 'laggard' (*híma*, 'to saunter,' 'loiter'), etc.; cf. also the nicknames *Tas-aldi* and *Leggj-aldi* (*leggr*, 'leg').

I derive the suffix *-ald-i*<sup>1</sup> from the stem *ald-* as in *qld* (fem.) < Goth. *ald-s*, 'time,' 'age.' In poetry the word *qld* may also signify 'the world as composed of human beings' and in the plural 'human beings,' 'men,' 'people,' lit. 'grown up' (*al-a*, 'to nourish,' 'bring up'); cf. Ger. *Erwachsene*, Lat. *adultus*. Thus we have *Vqlsp.*, XVI, 3, "mepan *qld* lifir," 'as long as the world (= men) lives,' and *Alvm.*, XV, 3, "es sea *alda synir*," 'which the sons of men see.' With *alda synir* cf. OS *eldi-barn*; in both OS and OE the plural form of this word *\*ald-i-s*, OS *eldi*:OE *ielde*, signifies 'people,' 'men.'

There is, therefore, nothing to prevent our assuming that the syllable *-ald* denotes simply 'a person,' 'human being,' the suffix *-i* < *\*-an* of the weak declension merely adding a more specific force to this idea; i.e., *-ald-i* = 'such a person as' has this or that characteristic.

### IV. THE SUFFIX *-átta*

The suffix *-átta* is used to form abstract substantives (which later could acquire a concrete sense); cf. *kunn-átta*, 'knowledge' (*kunn-a*, 'to know'); *vin-átta*, 'friendship' (cf. *vin-skapr*); *við-átta*, 'wideness,' 'openness' (*við-r*, 'wide'); *bar-átta*, 'a battle' from an earlier abstract sense 'battling,' 'giving battle' (cf. *bar-dagi*); *veðr-átta*, 'weather conditions' > 'weather,' 'temperature' (cf. *veðr-leikr*).

<sup>1</sup> Compounds in *-aldi* not denoting persons or the notion of agency may be considered as later analogical developments, some of which represent the suffix *-ald* (< *\*þi*: *\*di*) plus the endings of the weak declension, e.g., *kaf-ald*: *kaf-ald-i*, 'deep snow.'

Both Kluge<sup>1</sup> and Holthausen<sup>2</sup> derive the suffix *-átta* from PG *\*-aht-ôn*. They do not explain the root syllable *\*-aht-*, but if this root *\*-aht-* is identical with OHG *aht-a*, 'reflection,' 'opinion'; OHG *aht-ôn*: OS *aht-on*, 'to think,' 'regard,' the suffix *\*-ahtôn* > ON *-átta* would denote 'thinking (in a certain way)' and we should expect it to be attached to stems which signify a certain state of mind.

To be sure, such an original sense of the suffix *-átta* is conceivable, if we assume that it was first attached to stems which denoted a certain state of mind, such as, e.g., *vin-átta*, 'thinking friendly toward' > 'friendship,' and then spread to stems of a different nature.

But there are two factors which militate against this hypothesis.

First, we already have in ON a suffix *-úð* < *hugð*, 'mind' (cf. *hygg-ja*, 'to think'), which was attached to stems denoting a certain state of mind; cf. *ill-úð*, 'spite'; *var-úð*, 'heedfulness'; *ást-úð*, 'love'; *hard-úð*, 'hardness (of heart),' and with *g*-extension *hard-gýð-gi*, 'stubbornness.' It is therefore improbable that a suffix *\*-aht-ôn*, 'minded,' 'thinking,' if it existed at all, could have survived alongside the suffix *-úð* which had exactly the same force.

Second, the stem *\*aht-* occurs elsewhere in ON only in the verb *æt-la* < *\*aht-il-ôn*; which fact speaks against its appearance as a suffix.

The following explanation of the suffix *-átta* seems to me much more plausible, namely, as derived from *\*-aiht-ôn*.

The stem *\*-aiht-* occurs in Goth. *aiht-s*, 'property': ON *ætt:átt*, 'race,' 'generation,' 'family,' and is derived from the root *\*aig-* in Goth. *aig-an*: ON *eig-a*, 'to own.'

There can be no objection to the phonetic development *\*-aiht-ôn* > *-átta*,<sup>3</sup> cf. *\*aiht-i-s* > *ætt:átt*.

So far as the meaning of the suffix *-átta* is concerned, we may assume from its connection with the root *aig-*, 'to own,' that its fundamental sense was 'belonging to'; cf. *\*aiht-i-s* > Goth. *aihts*, 'that which one owns,' 'which belongs to one' > 'property': ON *ætt*, 'belonging to the family' > 'family,' 'race.'

From this fundamental sense of 'belonging to' was developed the general abstract force; cf. the suffix *-ung* denoting the idea of 'relationship,' 'belonging to' (as in patronymics like *Nífl-ung-r*, *Vqls-*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kluge, *op. cit.*, § 160b.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Holthausen, *op. cit.*, § 330, 8.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Noreen, *op. cit.*, § 54, 1.

*ung-r*), but which later acquired a verbal abstract force,<sup>1</sup> as in *horm-ung*, 'vexation'; *laus-ung*, 'loose living,' 'looseness'; *nauð-ung*, 'constraint,' etc.

The suffix *-átta* < \**aiht-ôn* signified then 'that which belongs to' > 'that which has to do with' = abstract force. According to the nature of the problem, this explanation can be considered only tentative.

Could the ON suffix *-átta* represent an \**aht-ôn* derived from the adjectival suffix *-ah:-ag* plus a *t*-extension (= \**aht*)? This seems to me unlikely inasmuch as the adjectival suffix *-ah:-ag* occurs very rarely in ON; only in the word *heil-ag-r*, so far as I know. In WGer., on the other hand, this suffix was very common, hence the OHG adjectival suffixes *-aht:-ag*.

#### V. THE SUFFIX *-orð*

The suffix *-orð* sometimes has the literal force of the independent word *orð*, 'word,' and sometimes lends an abstract force, which may not seem consonant with the idea of 'word.'

Examples of the first type are *heil-orð*, 'promise-word,' 'promise' (*heit*, 'promise'); *lof-orð*, 'permission-word,' 'permission' (*lofa*, 'to permit'); *vátt-orð*, 'word of a witness' (*vátttr*), 'testimony'; *vit-orð*, 'word of someone who knows' (*vita*, 'to know'), 'private counsel,' etc.

To the second type belong *god-orð*, 'priesthood'; *met-orð*, 'estimation,' 'valuation'; *leg-orð*, 'fornication,' 'seduction,' etc.

There is, however, no reason for separating the *-orð* of the second category from that of the first. I shall here attempt to trace the semantic development of the suffix *-orð*, showing how the abstract force of the word developed out of its literal, concrete sense.

There seem to be three different semantic lines of development along which the suffix *-orð*, 'word,' attained an abstract force.

##### a) 'WORD' > 'PROMISE' > 'FULFILMENT OF PROMISE' > 'RESULTANT CONDITION'

Under this head belong *gjaf-orð*, 'giving-word' > 'promise to give away in marriage' > 'marriage match'; *bon-orð*, 'petition-word' > 'seeking a promise (*-orð*) of marriage by petition (*bón-*)' > 'wooing,'

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also abstracts in *-ing*, which suffix denoted the same idea as *-ung*; cf. *dróttin-ing*, 'woman belonging to, connected with, the king (*dróttinn*)' > 'queen,' but *send-ing*, 'a sending'; also collectives in *-ja*, *ung-menni*, 'young people,' but *kynni*, 'knowledge.'

'courtship.' In the compound *leg-ord*, 'fornication,' 'seduction' (cf. *lega*, 'lying in bed') the semantic development of the suffix *-ord* is less clear but we may assume that its abstract force was due to the example of *gjaf-ord*, 'marriage match,' and *bon-ord*, 'wooing,' both of which, like *leg-ord*, imply sexual relations.

b) 'WORD' > 'DECREE' > 'RESULTANT CONDITION'

Under this head belong *ban(a)-ord*, 'death-word' > 'decree of death' > 'death'; similarly *dauda-ord*, 'death'; *urðar-ord*, 'fate-word' > 'decree of fate' > 'fate,' 'death' (cf. *dauda-yrðr*,<sup>1</sup> 'death-fate' > 'fate,' 'death').

c) 'WORD' > 'DECREE' > 'AUTHORITY' > 'RESULTANT STATE'

Under this head belong *god-ord*, 'priest- (*goði*) word' > 'authority of the priest' > 'priesthood'; *met-ord*, 'measuring- (*met-*) word' > 'authoritative measuring' > 'estimation,' 'valuation,' 'esteem,' etc.

With *-ord* in this sense cf. the suffix *-dómr*, 'judgment,' 'decree' > 'state,' 'condition,' as in *konung-dómr*, 'kingdom': OE *kyne-dóm*, also WGer. *\*-haid* < Goth. *haidus*, 'way,' 'manner' > 'function,' 'office' > 'state,' 'condition'; cf. OE *præost-hād*, 'office of priest' > 'priesthood,' with ON *god-ord*, 'authority of priest' > 'priesthood.'

It is also interesting to note that WGer. *\*-word* retains only the literal sense of 'word' and has not developed any of the derived senses characteristic of ON; cf. OS *êð-word*: ON *heit-ord*, 'oath,' 'promise'; OS *lof-word*, '(word of) praise': ON *lof-ord*, '(word of) permission'; OHG *mez-uuort*, 'gemässigte Rede,' and *skelt-uuort*, 'Scheltwort,' etc.<sup>2</sup>

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

<sup>1</sup> Because of this congruence of meaning between *dauda-ord* and *dauda-yrðr*, 'fate,' 'death,' Cleasby-Vigfússon (*Icelandic Dictionary*, p. 467, under *ord*) suggests an etymological connection between *ord* and *yrðr*. This is, of course, purely fantastical; the connection is semantic (*-ord* = 'decree': *-yrðr* = 'fate').

<sup>2</sup> This article was written too late to take into consideration the views expressed by Dr. Alexander Jóhannesson in his monograph *Die Suffixe im Isländischen* (Reykjavík, 1927).





IS SHAKESPEARE'S ANTONIO THE "WEEPING  
PHILOSOPHER" HERACLITUS?

THE apparently causeless or motiveless melancholy of Antonio in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* has given rise to much speculation among the critics. Three of the most expert modern Shakespeareans take it up: one, baffled, leaves it a mystery; another falls back on pathology to explain it; and still another, by way of explanation, suggests a "cut" in the play.

E. K. Chambers begins his essay on *The Merchant of Venice*: "The melancholy of Antonio is a perpetual undertone in the gaiety and the tribulation of *The Merchant of Venice*. It claims your pondering in the first significant words of the play: nor is its meaning, there or elsewhere, clearly or explicitly set forth."<sup>1</sup> Bradley<sup>2</sup> alludes to the "deep but quiet" melancholy of Antonio, "for which neither the victim nor his friends can assign any cause," adding in a footnote, "The critics have labored to find a cause but it seems to me . . . to portray a pathological condition." The latest word on the subject is to be found in The New Cambridge Shakespeare edition of *The Merchant of Venice*. The editors, Dover Wilson and Quiller Couch, in order to explain the absence of the motive of Antonio's melancholy,<sup>3</sup> think that "the explanation may have been lost in Shakespeare's second rehandling of the text." No satisfactory explanation, indeed, has ever been generally accepted for Antonio's melancholy.

A re-reading of the initial scene of *The Merchant of Venice* will make it plain that over against Antonio, the melancholy, are placed the characters of Salarino, Salanio, and more especially Gratiano, who uphold the side of mirth in the game of life as against deep-seated, settled melancholy. Time and again in the plays, even the general reader of Shakespeare is aware of now one, now another, of the characters maintaining incidentally that "a merry heart lives long a," but nowhere else is a whole scene given over to what almost amounts to

<sup>1</sup> *Shakespeare: A Survey* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, Ltd., 1925).

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 110.

<sup>3</sup> P. 122.

a balanced artificial debate in regard to this matter of the weeping and the laughing attitudes toward life. It seems very possible that this first scene in *The Merchant of Venice* (or in the old play which Shakespeare may have used as a basis for *The Merchant of Venice*) was affected by some dialogue treatment of this theme of melancholy versus joy. That Shakespeare was familiar with the "estриф" or "debat" form of poetry is certain. The last few lines of *Love's Labour's Lost* without going further into the matter demonstrate that. They consist of a medieval "estриф" motif, the Debate between Spring and Winter.

Now it so happens that one finds in the 1611, 1613, 1620, 1633, and 1641 editions of Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas<sup>1</sup> a dialogue between Heraclitus the weeping philosopher and Democritus the laughing philosopher. In carefully balanced fashion these two in twenty stanzas of four lines each debate the matter of sadness versus laughter.<sup>2</sup> If, as this paper will attempt to establish, it is true that some earlier edition of this very dialogue makes clear the otherwise inexplicable melancholy of Antonio in *The Merchant of Venice*, a brief history of the literary treatment of the Heraclitian melancholy and Democritian mirth will be warranted here, particularly in view of the fact that by way of this digression it will appear that the treatment of the Heraclitus-Democritus theme has its culmination in English poetry in Milton's *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* and in English prose in *The Laughing Philosopher*, recently ascribed to Charles Lamb.

This rather fanciful and apparently debased conception of Heraclitus, whom we are accustomed, as did Bacon, to associate with the "dry light of reason" unaffected by the emotions, is certainly as early as Juvenal.<sup>3</sup> Villey<sup>4</sup> has considered the antiquity and prevalence of this theme in connection with Montaigne's *Of Democritus and Heraclitus*, Essay L. He calls attention to its occurrence in Juvenal, Seneca, Diogones Laertius, among the ancients; in Philereimo, the Italian, at the beginning of the sixteenth century; in Messie; in Bouaystauau, Marcouville, Budé, La Primaudaye, Droit de Gaillard, Henri Estienne; and finally in Jacques Tahureau. To Villey's list may

<sup>1</sup> Du Bartas, *His Devine Weekes and Workes* (London, 1641), p. 281.

<sup>2</sup> A Dialogue upon the Troubles Past: between Heraclitus and Democritus, The weeping and laughing philosophers.

<sup>3</sup> Sat. x. 34.

<sup>4</sup> *Les Sources et l'Evolution des essais de Montaigne* (Paris, 1908), II, 35.

be added the following: a long Latin monologue, *Heraclyte ad Democritum de pace*, Elegea: parisus a hud Annetum Briere, via Oletoria, sub insigne Dine Sebastiane, 1559 (copy in Harvard Library). Guazzo,<sup>1</sup> in his *Civil Conversation*, is aware of the conventional notion: "Many ignorant men . . . will handle a pleasant matter so finely that they will make Heraclitus himself laugh." The *Dictionary of Anonymous Authors* lists *Democritus: or Doctor Merryman his medicines against melancholy humours*, written by S. R. (Samuel Rowlands), London, 1607. Peter Woodhouse, at least as early as 1605, in his *Democritus, His Dreame or the Contention between an Elephant and a Flea*,<sup>2</sup> in the first forty lines and at various other points throughout the poem falls into a dialogue treatment of this theme almost identically similar to the treatment of it in the dialogue included in almost all the editions of Joshua Sylvester's translations of Du Bartas, which more than any other dialogue will presently be found to be closely related to the treatment of the theme in *The Merchant of Venice*.

The most elaborate survival of this literary convention is to be found of course in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, in which Democritus and Heraclitus are referred to in their laughing and weeping capacities times innumerable. Charles Lamb continues the convention in his *Curious Fragments extracted from the Commonplace Book of Robert Burton*. And to him and to Thomas Hood has been recently ascribed *The Laughing Philosopher, being the entire works of Momus, Jester of Olympus: Democritus, The Merry Philosopher of Greece . . . translated into our vernacular tongue by John Bull* (Sherwood Jones & Co., 1825).<sup>3</sup> There is a *Democritus in London, with the mad pranks and comical conceits of Motley and Robin Goodfellow, etc.*, by George Daniel, 1822.<sup>4</sup> There is a *comédie en deux actes, en vers*, ca. 1855 (Harvard Library), wherein these two philosophers continue to carry on in their weeping and laughing capacities. The persistence of the convention is demonstrated by its recurrence in Santayana's *Dialogues in Limbo* in 1925, in which Democritus, the main character among the many good talkers there, is the laughing philosopher and is referred to

<sup>1</sup> Translation by Pettie and Young, Tudor Society.

<sup>2</sup> Grosart's *Reprints*, Vol. IV.

<sup>3</sup> Walter Jerrold, "Charles Lamb and the Laughing Philosopher," *Cornhill Magazine*, LVII, 541 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See *Dictionary of Anonymous Authors*; also *Gent. Mag.* (1852), p. 75.

as such. Lastly, in *The Story of Philosophy*<sup>1</sup> (1927), Will Durant alludes to Democritus and Heraclitus, calling Democritus by his right name, the "laughing," but failing to call Heraclitus by his right name, the "weeping." Of these writers who handle the theme it is interesting to note that Jacques Tahureau, Montaigne, Robert Burton, and Santayana stand out conspicuously as the avowed followers of Democritus in their philosophical attitudes toward life, preferring to accept the laughing point of view for living purposes. Tahureau and Burton are the most extreme instances of actual discipleship, the latter assuming and acting the part of Democritus. Burton passes under the pseudonym of Democritus, Jr., it will be remembered, making it his habit to go down to the wharf among the laborers in order to get cause for uproarious laughter at the absurd manifestations of human anger.<sup>2</sup>

The Heraclitus-Democritus theme in English poetry rises to a considerable degree of importance if, as may presently appear, it occurs (the occurrence has apparently been unobserved) in Milton. The editors of Milton are aware that prefixed to the *Anatomy of Melancholy* in 1621 is "The Author's Abstract of Melancholy, of A Dialogue between Pleasure and Pain,"<sup>3</sup> which is given credit as supplying the "initial idea" of the two poems *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*. But the editors do not seem to be aware that this dialogue is another variant of the debate of Heraclitus and Democritus in their capacities

<sup>1</sup> P. 108.

<sup>2</sup> See further: *Rissa y Planto de Democrito y Heraclito* . . . Fue Impresso en Valladolid, 1554; *The Riddles of Heraclitus and Democritus* [with the solutions], by T. Park, 1598; *Avisa Parnassiaci, Das ist: . . . Zum andern Heracliti und Democrati alter Philosophorum relation* . . . 1623; *Der lachende Democritus und weinende Heraclitus*. In Bozlegung david Mullers Buchendlers in Breslau 1632; *England's Ichabod*, Glory departed, discoursed by two Christian men, the one called Heraclitus, Junior, . . . the other called Democritus natu minimus, London, 1650; *Heraclitus Ridens*, at a Dialogue between Jest and Earnest concerning the times [By T. Flatman], 1681; *A New Dialogue betwixt Heraclitus and Towzer* i.e. Sir Roger L. Estrange concerning the times, London, 1681; *Democrati Turba Philosophorum oder derer Etats Malcontenten Meister-Gesang Heraclyti dediceret und in geheim publicerat* [1710?]; *Democriti Condolens an Heraclitum* [Satirical Dialogues. On the defeat of the French arms by the Duke of Marlborough in the war of the Spanish succession 1702-13], 1710; *Democritus en Heraclitus Brabantische Voyage*. Bezweering vanden desperaten Antwerpschen Courantier [Amsterdam], 1712; *Heraclet en Democriet*. Zinnebeeldig Verdivissement met zang en dans [Amsterdam?] 1763; *Zaamenspraak tusschen Democritus en Heraclitus* . . . P. F. Gosse, 1783; *Dialogo tra Eracito e Democrito Redivivi sulla Rovuzio politico di Venizia*, 1797. The matter of the use of the name Heraclitus or Democritus as a pseudonym by the political and theological pamphleteers hardly belongs here. There are some fifty or more listed under these titles in the catalogue of the British Museum alone.

<sup>3</sup> So entitled in the Students Cambridge edition of *Milton's Complete Works*, p. 23, and so called by R. E. Browne, *English Poems by John Milton* (Clarendon Press, 1897), p. 267.

respectively of the weeping and laughing philosophers. One needs only to turn and read it in connection with the other examples cited here to conclude that it is unmistakably a part of the Heraclitus-Democritus development in English poetry.

For the immediate purpose in hand, however, it is important to notice here that of the many treatments of the theme of Heraclitus and Democritus as the weeping and laughing philosophers, the *Dialogue* in Sylvester's editions of *The Devine Weekes* helps best to throw light on the contention between Antonio, spokesman for melancholy, and Gratiano and his group, spokesmen for mirth, in the first scene of the first act of *The Merchant of Venice*. The most extraordinary of all the lines spoken by Antonio in the play are those in which he emphasizes to Gratiano his melancholy attitude to life as against the laughing attitude of Gratiano. Notice the extraordinary similarity of this speech to that of Democritus speaking to Heraclitus in the *Dialogue* of Sylvester, a similarity too definite to be brushed aside as an Elizabethan commonplace. Commonplaces indeed have been assembled in connection with the better-known saying of Jacques in *As You Like It*,

**All the world's a stage  
And all the men and women merely players.<sup>1</sup>**

But none of them corresponds closely to the very words of Antonio. Those of the *Dialogue* cited here do correspond very closely:

*I hold the world but as the world,  
Gratiano,  
A stage where every man must play  
his part  
And I a sad one.<sup>2</sup>*

It so happens, moreover, that only one hundred and sixty lines further forward in *The Merchant of Venice* Portia comes back to a reconsideration of the sadness-mirth theme and characterizes one of her suitors, the County Palatine, as follows: "He hears merry tales and smiles not. I fear he will prove the *weeping philosopher* when he grows old, being so full of unmannerly sadness in his youth. I had rather be

<sup>1</sup> Furness' Variorum edition of *As You Like It*.

\* *Merchant of Venice*, I, i, 77, 78.

<sup>1</sup> Du Bartas, *loc. cit.* Among the many Elizabethan commonplaces which have been gathered in connection with Jacques' "All the world's a stage," it will appear upon examination that none of them so closely resembles the passage cited above from *The Merchant of Venice* as this one from Sylvester's *Dialogue*.

married to a death's head with a bone in his mouth."<sup>1</sup> By this time it is apparent that "the weeping philosopher" is the well-known Elizabethan term descriptive of Heraclitus. These considerations, one of them in the very body of the debate over melancholy and mirth waged by Antonio and Gratiano, and the other almost immediately after it, make it appear likely that Shakespeare or whoever wrote the original draft of *The Merchant of Venice* had read this same dialogue or some dialogue from which it came. In addition to the structural similarity of the first scene of *The Merchant of Venice* and *A Dialogue* and the very remarkable similarity of phrasing cited above, certain minor details of expression in *A Dialogue* strengthen the impression that Shakespeare had read it. For example, although he employs the word "sport" some one hundred and twenty-odd times in his plays, he uses the combination "merry sport" but once. This combination is in *A Dialogue*. And it is not without significance that in *The Merchant of Venice* it is to be found, when found at all, in Act I.<sup>2</sup> Likewise, the phrase "iron age," which occurs only once in the plays,<sup>3</sup> is to be found in *A Dialogue*. The extraordinary lines in *A Dialogue* suggest obviously enough the extraordinary lines from the melancholy Hamlet:

Melt thee distill thee	O, that this too too	Distill'd almost to
turne to wax or snow,	solid flesh would	Jelly.
Make sad thy gesture,	melt,	
turne thy voyce to	Thaw and resolve it-	
woe.	self into a dew!	

The line in *A Dialogue*, "When I heare Porters prate of State designs," suggests further: "And hear poor rogues,/Talk of court news."<sup>4</sup>

It is a matter of common knowledge that during the time when Shakespeare was reading very actively and widely and doubtless conversing very actively and widely with Jonson and many another widely read man of his age, Sylvester was being read by the great body of literary men in London.<sup>5</sup> The fact that the many men associated with Shakespeare in various capacities were also associated with Sylvester,

<sup>1</sup> *Merchant of Venice*, I, ii, 52 ff. The note interpreting this phrase in the Furness Variorum edition of *As You Like It* consists simply of the word "Heraclitus."

<sup>2</sup> Scene iii, l. 146.

<sup>3</sup> *King John*, IV, i, 60.

<sup>4</sup> *Lear*, V, iii, 13-14.

<sup>5</sup> See A. H. Upham, *French Influence in English Literature*, pp. 152 ff.; H. Ashton, *Du Bartas en Angleterre* (1908).



from Southampton to Ben Jonson, makes it rather improbable that Shakespeare should have left unturned the leaves of a writer the years of whose life coincided more exactly with his own than those of any other literary man of his age, and one, moreover, whose literary vogue was for many years during Shakespeare's most active reading years as great as Shakespeare's own.<sup>1</sup> Of course, if one prefers to do so, it is open to him to believe that Sylvester was the borrower if any borrowing there may be. It is also true that in the case of many of the passages cited the printed Shakespeare play was earlier than the first known printed collected works of Sylvester's *Du Bartas* (1605-6). Sylvester, however, had announced this translation in 1590, and, as in the case of Florio's translation of Montaigne's essays, many portions of this work were completed long before the final publication of the complete works.<sup>2</sup> Other things being equal, it would seem to be more reasonable to assume that Shakespeare was influenced by Sylvester. Shakespeare himself, as has been shown in innumerable instances, having an astonishing memory, was extraordinarily given to that sort of thing.

Wherever he may have got it from, Shakespeare was familiar with the Heraclitus-Democritus device for dallying with the theme of melancholy versus mirth, and employed it as literary men did before him and are doing to this day. He had certainly read the essay on the subject in Florio's *Montaigne*. But this would not go far toward explaining the first scene in *The Merchant of Venice*. His familiarity with the theme, however, as developed in the *Dialogue* would help to explain it.

It is interesting to note on leaving the subject that the earliest biographer of Shakespeare finds in the Heraclitus-Democritus convention a clever means of praising the comedies and tragedies of Shakespeare. Says Bishop Fuller, "so that Heraclitus himself . . . might afford to smile at his comedies they were so merry, and Democritus scarce forbears to sigh at his tragedies they were so mournful."<sup>3</sup>

GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

<sup>1</sup> Sidney Lee, *The French Renaissance in England*, pp. 344, 346 ff.; Upham, *op. cit.*, pp. 156 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For an aid to the dates of the different portions of the translation of the *Divine Weekes* and of his own poems see Joshua Sylvester, *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; Upham, *op. cit.*, pp. 152 ff.; Grosart's edition of Sylvester (*Chertsey Worthies*, 1880), Introduction.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England* (ed. P. Austin Nutthall; London, 1840), III, 284.





## THE TRANSCENDENTALISM OF WILLIAM WORDSWORTH

### I

THE recent publication of the revised edition of Professor Arthur Beatty's study, *William Wordsworth: His Doctrine and Art in Their Historical Relations*,<sup>1</sup> once again calls to the attention of scholars a revolutionary thesis. The author recognizes the early influence of Rousseau and Godwin upon Wordsworth, but he finds in David Hartley and English associationism the main and almost exclusive factor that influenced the philosophy of the mature Wordsworth who published the *Lyrical Ballads* and the subsequent poetry. He believes that in the *Lyrical Ballads* "we find the poet committed to his [Hartley's] theory of the mind once and for all."<sup>2</sup>

The revised edition does not modify the thesis of the previous volume. On the contrary, the main contentions are enforced in two important respects: The author amplifies and greatly strengthens the argument that Wordsworth was un-Rousseauistic, and that the poet derived his doctrine of the "three ages of man" from Hartley.

Nevertheless the reader is a little disappointed in his revision. In the Preface to the second edition, we are informed that Professor de Selincourt's publication of the early manuscript versions of *The Prelude* has afforded a "mass of fresh evidence" to show that "the influence of associationism" was "even more precise and fundamental than the later text of the poem indicates." We are surprised, therefore, to find that only three quotations are made from De Selincourt's manuscripts, one in a footnote and two in quoted passages which are not very vital.<sup>3</sup> Finally, in the first text, a number of crucial and ambiguous passages were not sufficiently analyzed to convince the reader that no other than associationistic doctrines were expressed;

<sup>1</sup> University of Wisconsin Press, 1927.

<sup>2</sup> P. 71. A clear exposition of Hartley's "theory of the mind" is given by Mr. Beatty on pp. 109-27.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. pp. 190-91.

the new edition seldom gives a more rigorous analysis of these disputable quotations.

Before plunging into an examination of Wordsworth's poetry, let us examine Mr. Beatty's direct evidence that Wordsworth was a follower of Hartley.

1. He indicates that Godwin, to a considerable extent, was a Hartleian. This evidence was merely intended to show that Wordsworth must early have become acquainted with the principles of associationism. It does not show that Wordsworth became a convert, or that his mind remained unchanged throughout the remainder of his creative life.

2. We are told that Coleridge, for a time, was devoted to Hartley. This is indisputable. Mr. Beatty, however, points out that "De Quincey testifies that by 1807 Coleridge had abandoned Hartley; and this is well within the truth."<sup>1</sup> As a matter of fact, Coleridge had abandoned Hartley long before 1807. The original passage from De Quincey, referred to by Mr. Beatty, would seem to indicate this:

It is known to most literary people that Coleridge was, in early life, so passionate an admirer of the Hartleian philosophy, that Hartley was the sole baptismal name which he gave his eldest child. . . . But at present [August, 1807] all this was a *forgotten* thing.<sup>2</sup>

The implication is that the allegiance to Hartley had long before been broken. In a letter to Richard Poole, dated March 16, 1801, Coleridge wrote:

If I do not greatly delude myself, I have not only *completely extricated the notions of time and space*, but have overthrown the doctrine of associationism, as taught by Hartley, and with it all the irreligious metaphysics of modern infidels—especially the doctrine of necessity.<sup>3</sup>

The denial of associationism is repeated in subsequent letters. Two years later, on August 7, 1803, Coleridge wrote to Southey:

This explanation [Coleridge's theory of memory] will derive additional value if you would look into Hartley's solution of the phenomena—how flat, how wretched! Believe me, Southey! a metaphysical solution, that does not instantly *tell* you something in the heart is grievously to be suspected as apocryphal. I almost think that ideas *never* recall ideas, as far as they are

<sup>1</sup> P. 102.

<sup>2</sup> De Quincey, *Works* (ed. Adam and Charles Black), II, 56. Italics are mine.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters*, I, 348-49.

ideas, any more than leaves in a forest create each other's motion. The breeze it is that runs through them—it is the soul, the state of feeling. If I had said no *one* idea ever recalls another, I am confident that I could support the assertion.<sup>1</sup>

In denouncing Hartley and associationism, Coleridge was expressing his aversion to the entire philosophical tradition to which Hartley owed allegiance. In a letter to Southey written in July, 1801, he declared that "Locke, Hume, and Hobbes . . . stink worse than feather or assafoetida."<sup>2</sup> The *Biographia literaria* corroborates the evidence furnished by Coleridge's letters. In discussing the period prior to his discovery of Kant, he wrote:

After I had successively studied in the schools of Locke, Berkeley, Leibnitz, and Hartley, and could find in neither of them an abiding place for my reason, I began to ask myself, is a system of philosophy, as different from mere history and historic classification, possible?<sup>3</sup>

He then relates his discovery of Jacob Behmen and of Kant. We know that the serious study of Kant was begun as early as 1801. We must, therefore, date the dissatisfaction with Hartley prior to this time. This is in harmony with the evidence furnished by the letters, which prove that as early as March 16, 1801, Coleridge had lost his admiration for associationism.

We have evidence, moreover, that at least a partial recantation of Hartleian theory occurred at a much earlier date than 1801. In the British Museum is a small manuscript notebook, written by Coleridge between the spring of 1795 and the spring or summer of 1798.<sup>4</sup> On page 27 of this notebook, following a quotation from Jacob Boehme, appears the following significant entry:

Certainly, there are strange things in the other world, and so there are in all the steps to it; and a little *glimpse* of Heaven—a moment's conversing with an angel—any ray of God, any communication from the spirit of Comfort, which God gives to his servants in strange and unknown manners,—are infinitely far from illusions. We shall understand them when we feel them, and when, in new and strange needs we shall be refreshed by them.<sup>5</sup>

These words were written toward the latter part of 1796. They are in obvious contradiction to Hartley's sensationalistic psychology.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 428. \*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 358.

<sup>3</sup> Chap. ix, p. 85.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. J. L. Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu* (Boston and New York, 1927), p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted by Alois Brandl, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge and the English Romantic School* (London, 1887), p. 173.

Another piece of evidence is provided in the 1797 edition of Coleridge's early poems. To the poem "To a Friend," written in 1794, he appended the significant footnote:

I utterly recant the sentiment contained in the lines—

"Of whose omniscient and all-spreading Love  
Aught to implore were impotence of mind,"

it being written in Scripture, "Ask and it shall be given you," and my human reason being moreover convinced of the propriety of offering *petitions* as well as thanksgivings to Deity.

Can this note be reconciled with Hartley's necessitarianism and absolute empiricism? Hartley's cardinal doctrine, that every mental state must arise from one's immediate environment or from memory, and that no agency, human or divine, can interfere with the necessary sequences of causation, is most surely in contradiction to the belief that God will answer the individual human petitioner. As early as 1796, a similar depreciation of the "mechanical philosophy" is contained in Coleridge's footnote to Southey's *Joan of Arc*.<sup>1</sup>

We have still more evidence that by 1797 Coleridge's devotion to Hartley was weakening. In his old age Coleridge wrote the following comment on a poem, *The Destiny of Nations*, composed in 1796:

Within twelve months after the writing of this Poem my bold Optimism, and Necessitarianism, together with the *Infra*, seu plusquam-Socinianism, down to which, step by step, I had *unbelieved*, gave way to the day-break of a more genial and less shallow system.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Gingerich, in quoting this important bit of evidence, warns us that Coleridge was often inaccurate concerning dates in his own life. The footnote appended to the 1797 edition, the previous note to Southey's poem, and the entry in the British Museum notebook, however, provide independent confirmation of Coleridge's statement. After carefully reviewing the evidence, and after pointing out that traces of associationism appear in Coleridge's writing after 1797, Mr. Gingerich finally concludes: "The change seems to have come gradually and is not distinctly marked until around 1799, and later."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Joseph Cottle, *Early Recollections of S. T. Coleridge*, II, 242. Cited by J. Shawcross, *Biographia literaria* (1907), p. xxx.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by S. F. Gingerich, *PMLA*, XXXV (1920), 23.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

To some extent by 1797, therefore, and most certainly by March, 1801, Coleridge's influence upon Wordsworth must have been directed against Hartley, Locke, Hume, and Hobbes.<sup>1</sup> When we consider how very close was the spiritual intimacy between the two poets, how very great was Wordsworth's reliance upon Coleridge's counsel and criticism, it seems highly improbable that Coleridge's arguments would have left Wordsworth unaffected.

3. Mr. Beatty records that Hazlitt visited Wordsworth in the summer of 1798, and engaged in metaphysical arguments. At this time Hazlitt was a follower of Hartley. This evidence, also, merely indicates that Wordsworth must have known something about Hartley.

4. Wordsworth himself refers to Hartley in a letter to Richard Sharp, written September 27, 1808. Mr. Beatty thus quotes from the letter:

In a letter written to Richard Sharp in 1808, he speaks of Hartley as one among the "men of real power, who go before their age"; and exclaims, obviously referring to his own rediscovery of Hartley's book upon Man, "How many years did it sleep in almost entire oblivion!"<sup>2</sup>

By the "rediscovery of Hartley's book" Mr. Beatty is referring to the supposed revival of Wordsworth's interest in Hartleianism in the years subsequent to the reaction against Godwin. In the form in which Mr. Beatty quotes from Wordsworth, this tribute to the philosopher of associationism is impressive. The quotation, however, is not given in its original form and connotation. Wordsworth is discussing the Copyright Law:

The law, as it now stands, merely consults the interest of the useful drudges in Literature, or of flimsy and shallow writers, whose works are upon a level with the taste and knowledge of the age; while men of real power, who go before their age, are deprived of all hope of their families being benefited by their exertions. Take, for instance, in Philosophy, Hartley's book upon Man. How many years did it sleep in almost entire oblivion?<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is true that as late as June 4, 1803, Coleridge proposed to prefix to Tucker's *Light of Nature* an Introduction expounding the first volume of Hartley (cf. A. Turnbull's *Biographia epistolaris* [London, 1911], I, 274), but in the same letter he also announced a long exposition of Plato, who is at the opposite pole from Hartley.

<sup>2</sup> P. 102.

<sup>3</sup> Knight, I, 379. Mr. Beatty cites the same edition.

Mr. Beatty, in his quotation from this passage, has been careless. In the most important sentence, he has substituted an exclamation point in place of a question mark, thus decidedly altering the meaning. He has neglected the context, without which his quotation cannot be accurately understood. To illustrate his contention, Wordsworth needed to cite worthy writers who had been unappreciated during their lifetime, who were neglected for some time after their death, whose books finally came into public favor, and whose families remained in distress. Obviously not many such examples would occur to the mind. Why should we, then, attach any large significance to the mention of Hartley, who merely happened to be one of the few writers who would serve as an appropriate example? One is not justified, moreover, in saying that Wordsworth is "obviously referring to his own rediscovery of Hartley's book upon Man." The poet is certainly referring to a very different thing, to public neglect and belated public appreciation; because only this, and not Wordsworth's rediscovery of the book, could have deprived Hartley's family of all hope of being benefited by publisher's receipts. What reason have we to suppose, upon the basis of this solitary citation of Hartley's name in Wordsworth's works, that the prophet of associationism was at that time exercising any profound influence upon the Lake poet?

If the philosopher truly did furnish the lasting foundation for Wordsworth's outlook upon life, it is singular that the poet did not mention Hartley to more of his friends. There is no other mention of Hartley in the letters, and none in Grosart's edition of the *Prose Works*. Moreover, Henry Crabb Robinson, who knew both Wordsworth and Coleridge intimately from 1810 throughout most of the subsequent years, refers to Hartley only once in his *Diary and Reminiscences*. This single reference states that Coleridge, in 1810, was opposed to both Locke and Hartley.<sup>1</sup> The omission is significant, because Robinson faithfully recorded Wordsworth's ideas upon a large number of subjects, and almost certainly would have known the poet's allegiance to Hartley. Even more significant is the negative evidence in the *Biographia literaria*. In large part this book is devoted to a criticism of Hartley and Wordsworth. Chapters v and vi con-

<sup>1</sup> Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Lamb, etc., being selections from the *Remains of Henry Crabb Robinson* (ed. Edith J. Morley), p. 36.



tain a denunciation of associationism and its prophet. Six of the later chapters deal with Wordsworth. These chapters contain Coleridge's most complete criticism of his friend. Nowhere does the author complain that Wordsworth is a follower of Hartley. What would be more natural, if the writer of *The Excursion* were a consistent associationist, than to mention this as one of his faults? In view of the previous detailed attack upon Hartley, it is particularly probable that Coleridge would have done this. But he never so much as implies that Wordsworth is an associationist.

In consideration of its context, and in the absence of any substantiating evidence that is not inferential, the single reference to Hartley by Wordsworth himself is very inconclusive.

## II

The remainder of Mr. Beatty's evidence is in Wordsworth's works, especially in his poetry. We must now review the principal tenets of associationism in connection with this larger body of material.

### a) NECESSITARIANISM

In a letter written to Thomas Poole, January 15, 1804, Coleridge said:

I love and honour you, Poole, for many things—scarcely for anything more than that, trusting in the rectitude and simplicity of your own heart . . . you never suffered either my subtlety, or my eloquence, to proselytize you to the pernicious doctrine of Necessity. All praise to the Great Being who has graciously enabled me to find my way out of that labyrinth-den of sophistry, and, I would fain believe, to bring with me a better clue than has hitherto been known, to enable others to do the same. I have convinced Southey and Wordsworth, and W., as you know, was, even to extravagance, a Necessitarian.<sup>1</sup>

That Coleridge had in mind the necessitarianism of Hartley seems almost certain in the light of his previous references to the doctrine of necessity. In a letter to Southey, dated December 11, 1794, he remarked:

I am a complete necessitarian, and understand the subject as well almost as Hartley himself, but I go farther than Hartley, and believe the corporeality of thought, namely, that it is motion.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, II, 454.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 113.

And in the quotation that I have previously cited, dated in March, 1801, Coleridge announced:

I . . . have overthrown the doctrine of association, as taught by Hartley, and with it all the irreligious metaphysics of modern infidels—especially the doctrine of necessity.<sup>1</sup>

In view of these previous declarations, it is safe to say that Coleridge was referring to Hartley's doctrine. Now, if Wordsworth were, "even to extravagance, a Necessitarian," and if he cast aside this tenet which he maintained with such devotion, might we not expect him almost completely to have abandoned Hartley?

#### b) OPTIMISM

Hartley's optimism and necessitarianism are linked together. Mr. Beatty explains:

Ultimate attainment of the good was connected by Hartley with necessitarianism, for this attainment of the good was no secondary thing, but a prime necessity in the very nature of things; a doctrine accepted by Wordsworth in his earlier maturity, however modified it may have been in his later years.<sup>2</sup>

In other words, this progression of the soul toward the good was inevitable, so long as the individual really had experiences which furnished material for the processes of association.

In the poem *Ruth*, however, composed in 1799, just after the supposed conversion to Hartleianism, Wordsworth writes of a wild youth who was only encouraged in his sinful irregularity by natural objects.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Beatty comments upon the poem as follows:

Ruth's husband lived in the open air, in England, in Georgia, and on the ocean; but he got nothing but evil. Why is this? Because he *gave* nothing in the way of feeling, so that his mind had nothing to transmute into the higher forms of feeling, and he developed into a savage and never reached the moral heights of a man.<sup>4</sup>

In other words, according to this interpretation, the associational processes were blocked, because no feeling was present to be associated with the materials of sensation. But Wordsworth's description of "this stripling, sportive, gay, and bold" does not for a moment suggest that he was deficient in feeling. Does not this poem, therefore, con-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 348.

<sup>2</sup> P. 119.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. ll. 127-32.

<sup>4</sup> P. 213.

stitute an important qualification to Hartley's doctrine of optimistic necessitarianism? If the associational processes lead to good only when the individual is not too "impetuous," too "irregular," what happens to the "necessity" for a development toward a higher spiritual plane?

In *The Excursion* the poet points out his divergence from Hartley. After the Wanderer has given the Solitary instructions how to commune with nature, he finally concludes:

So build we up the Being that we are;  
Thus deeply drinking-in the soul of things  
Shall we be wise perforce; and, while inspired  
By choice, and conscious that the Will is free,  
Shall move unswerving, even as if impelled  
By strict necessity, along the path  
Of order and of good.<sup>1</sup>

Is it difficult to discern in this passage, to be found in the 1814 edition of *The Excursion*, a reference to Hartley's doctrine of optimistic necessitarianism? Wordsworth says, in effect: If we follow the instructions suggested by the Wanderer, we shall become wise perforce. As a matter of fact, the will is free, and choice could dispose us otherwise, but if we should really "drink in the soul of things" we would be elevated to higher realms of spirituality. We who are free to do otherwise would progress "as if impelled by strict necessity," as if Hartley's doctrine were true. Mr. Beatty quotes, as evidence of Wordsworth's necessitarianism, the first three lines of this passage down to the semicolon after "perforce." But the remainder of the passage establishes the meaning and proves that Wordsworth was not a necessitarian. Clearly the will cannot be free and at the same time be "impelled by strict necessity," and it is therefore impossible to accept Mr. Beatty's interpretation of the latter phrase.

If Wordsworth had abandoned necessitarianism by 1804, as Coleridge's letter clearly indicates, one of the most important tenets of Hartleianism had been discarded at least a year before the completion of *The Prelude*. The passage from Book IV of *The Excursion*, whenever it was written in its entirety, proves that by that time Wordsworth did not accept necessitarianism, particularly in the optimistic form that Hartley had presented.

<sup>1</sup> IV, 1264-70.

## c) THE THREE AGES OF MAN

Mr. Beatty thus summarizes this theory:

Wordsworth clearly announces as the source of his belief in the integrity of mind and as the ground of his hope a scheme of individual mental development in three stages, or ages, each one of which is linked with the other in a causal connection. . . . In the poet's own words, we may characterize the periods in the following terms: 1. Childhood, or Boyhood, is the age of *sensation*; 2. Youth is the age of *feeling*; and, 3. the period of the After Years, or Maturity, is the age of *thought*.<sup>1</sup>

This doctrine, we are told, was an integral part of associationism.

I do not wish to question the evidence for this assertion. It becomes obvious, upon reading the quotations selected by Mr. Beatty, that the foundation for Wordsworth's theory existed in the writings of the associationists. It would be hazardous to conclude, however, upon the basis of mere resemblance, that the poet derived his own conceptions from Locke, Berkeley, Hume, and Hartley; because Rousseau had thoroughly popularized the belief that the mind develops in stages, and that the age of thought does not arrive until early manhood. Wordsworth's theory, also, is so decidedly autobiographical in its application, so deeply anchored in his own experience, that any search for the source of his ideas seems nearly superfluous.

In his discussion of Wordsworth's doctrine, moreover, Mr. Beatty has overlooked a fact of fundamental significance. In *Tintern Abbey*, the poem in which the theory is given its earliest and one of its most lucid formulations, these stages are supplemented by a fourth and independent stage. This stage is the mystical experience, which is so far differentiated from the other three that it deserves separate attention. At the time of writing *Tintern Abbey*, Wordsworth attributed this mystical state to the influence of the "beauteous forms" of nature. It is nevertheless important to note that in addition to the period of animal sensation, to the stage in which the love of nature was a "hunger" and a "passion," and to the mature period of thought, Wordsworth recognized another phase of consciousness in which "the body is laid asleep," and thought itself is transformed into a "living soul."

<sup>1</sup> P. 74.

That these supersensuous experiences came to him frequently and at an early age is indicated by Wordsworth's prefatory note to the *Ode on the Intimations of Immortality*:

. . . . I was often unable to think of external things as having external existence, and I communed with all that I saw as something not apart from, but inherent in, my own immaterial nature. Many times while going to school have I grasped at a wall or a tree to recall myself from this abyss of idealism to the reality.

Rev. R. P. Graves, at one time pastor at Windermere, wrote testimony to the same effect.<sup>1</sup>

In the fifth stanza of the *Ode*, a stanza which was written in 1806, eight years after *Tintern Abbey*, Wordsworth attributes the child's mystical intuitions to the presence of innate ideas:

Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:  
The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star,  
Hath had elsewhere its setting,  
And cometh from afar:  
Not in entire forgetfulness,  
And not in utter nakedness,  
But trailing clouds of glory do we come  
From God, who is our home:  
Heaven lies about us in our infancy!

The soul does not come into the world in "utter nakedness"; it "cometh from afar." This explicit statement of the doctrine of innate ideas is very unsatisfactorily treated in Mr. Beatty's account. He cites a portion of Wordsworth's comment upon the poem:

To that dreamlike vividness and splendour which invest objects of sight in childhood, everyone, I believe, if he would look back, could bear testimony, and I need not dwell upon it here: but having in the poem regarded it as presumptive evidence of a prior state of existence, I think it right to protest against a conclusion, which has given pain to some good and pious persons, that I meant to inculcate such a belief. . . . I took hold of the notion of pre-existence as having sufficient foundation in humanity for authorizing me to make for my purpose the best use of it I could as a poet.

Mr. Beatty seems to believe that this comment disposes of the problem. But does it? The central meaning of the passage is not the idea of pre-existence, but the thought that we come into the world with innate ideas which have been bestowed on us by God.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Prose Works* (ed. Grosart), III, 467.

Nothing in the comment of Wordsworth would contradict this doctrine. Many men have believed in the doctrine of innate ideas who have rejected the idea of pre-existence. If one employs the comparative method to aid in the interpretation of this poem, he discovers that the doctrine of innate ideas is very clearly expressed in the poem "Yes, It Was the Mountain Echo," written during the same year as the preceding lines from the *Ode*. We have no reason, therefore, to believe that Wordsworth was indulging in a mere poetic conceit when he wrote: "... trailing clouds of glory do we come." In Wordsworth's comment, moreover, the poet does not deny belief even in the Platonic theory of "reminiscence"; he merely says that he did not mean "to inculcate such a belief." This comment, written in Wordsworth's old age, after Christian orthodoxy had gained control of his mind, contains the following additional declaration:

It [the theory of reminiscence] is far too shadowy a notion to be recommended to faith as more than an element in our instincts of immortality. But let us bear in mind that, though the idea is not advanced in Revelation, there is nothing to contradict it, and the fall of man presents an analogy in its favour.<sup>1</sup>

These words suggest that Wordsworth was at least half-convinced of pre-existence.

Mr. H. W. Garrod, in his recent book *Wordsworth: Lectures and Essays* (Oxford, 1923), does well to quote Coleridge's interpretation of the poem:

The *Ode* was intended for such readers only as had been accustomed to watch the flux and reflux of their inmost nature, to venture at times into the twilight realms of consciousness, and to feel a deep interest in modes of inmost being, to which they know that the *attributes of time and space are inapplicable and alien*, but which can yet not be conveyed, save in symbols of time and space. For such readers the sense is sufficiently plain, and they will be as little disposed to charge Mr. Wordsworth with believing the Platonic pre-existence in the ordinary meaning of the words, as I am to believe that Plato himself ever meant or taught it!<sup>2</sup>

This interpretation by the friend who knew Wordsworth's mind most intimately fully bears out the view that Wordsworth was expressing transcendental doctrines. Wordsworth rejected the idea of pre-existence only "in the ordinary meaning of the words," and he was

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 195-96.

<sup>2</sup> *Biographia literaria*, chap. xxii, p. 271. Italics are mine.

writing about "modes of inmost being, to which . . . the attributes of time and space are inapplicable and alien," about those modes, in other words, which transcend the sensory knowledge that forms the materials of association.

We have seen that Wordsworth really recognized four stages in spiritual development, and that one of these stages was a mystical one. In *Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey* he attributed these mystical states to the influence of nature, but in the *Ode*, written six years later, he explained these visionary moments by the presence of innate ideas.

### III

#### a) INNATE IDEAS AND THE PROCESSES OF ASSOCIATION

We now come to the crux of the problem. Mr. Beatty writes of Wordsworth:

There can be no manner of doubt that he approaches the problem of mind from the angle of Locke, basing his *whole theory* on the assumption that thought originates in experience, and that out of the product of sensation, or experience, ideas and the more complex forms of mentality are developed.<sup>1</sup>

Let us examine the evidence.

Mr. Ernest de Selincourt, in his new edition of *The Prelude* (Oxford, 1926), quotes a hitherto-unpublished fragment of poetry indicative of Wordsworth's attitude toward associationism. These lines are taken from a manuscript notebook filled with an early version of *Peter Bell* and various fragments from other poems. Upon the basis of the internal evidence afforded by the notebook, Mr. de Selincourt decides that these lines were probably written between the summer of 1798 and February, 1800. Mr. Beatty believes that Wordsworth fully absorbed Hartleianism during the years 1795-98; therefore the following lines were written after Wordsworth's "conversion":

I seemed to learn [        ]<sup>2</sup>  
That what we see of forms and images  
Which float along our minds, and what we feel  
Of active or recognizable thought,  
Prospectiveness, or intellect, or will,  
Not only is not worthy to be deemed

<sup>1</sup> P. 108. Italics are mine.

<sup>2</sup> The remainder of the line is illegible in the present state of the manuscript.



Our being, to be prized as what we are,  
 But is the very littleness of life.  
 Such consciousness I deem but accidents,  
 Relapses from the one interior life  
 That lives in all things, sacred from the touch  
 Of that false secondary power by which  
 In weakness we create distinctions, then  
 Believe that all our puny boundaries are things  
 Which we perceive and not which we have made;  
 —In which all beings live with god, themselves  
 Are god, Existing in the mighty whole,  
 As indistinguishable as the cloudless East  
 At noon is from the cloudless west, when all  
 The hemisphere is one cerulean blue.<sup>1</sup>

Some of these lines in altered form were incorporated into the second book of *The Prelude*.<sup>2</sup> This fragment proves that Wordsworth, even at the time when his adherence to Hartley seems the strongest, accepted associationism with the greatest reservations. Forms and images, which are the stuff of association, represent "the very littleness of life." Intellective processes, which Hartley regarded as causally antecedent to all emotions whatsoever, Wordsworth calls mere "relapses" from the unitary life of God in which all beings share. All "our puny boundaries" are man made; the true reality is the ineffable unity. The "one interior life lives in all things"; therefore sensations, with their report of the external world, are mere "accidents" in comparison with an inner supersensuous truth. Here we have a sweeping denial of the senses and the reason, and an assertion of a completely mystical philosophy.

I would agree with Mr. Beatty that *The Prelude* is deeply affected by the associational psychology. But in the light of the passage that I have just quoted, it is certain that Wordsworth's deepest allegiance was to a mystical philosophy. I have no doubt that he found the language of associationism very useful in describing "the growth of a poet's mind"; for mysticism has no language of its own; it has always insisted upon the ineffability of truth.

We find many indications that the author of *The Prelude* was stepping beyond the boundaries of Hartleianism. For instance, Coleridge, in *Table Talk* (July 21, 1832), declares:

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ll. 512-13.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. ll. 216-19.

I cannot help regretting that Wordsworth did not first publish his thirteen books on the growth of the individual mind—superior, as I used to think, upon the whole, to *The Excursion*. . . . Then the plan laid out, and, I believe partly suggested by me, was that Wordsworth should assume the station of a man in mental repose, one whose principles were made up, and so prepared to deliver upon authority a system of philosophy. He was to treat man as man,—a subject of eye, ear, touch, and taste, in contact with external nature, and *informing the senses from the mind, and not compounding a mind out of the senses*. . . . [My italics.]

Mr. Beatty comments upon this passage from Coleridge; after declaring that Wordsworth based "his whole theory on the assumption that thought originates in experience," he continues:

It is a mark of that fundamental difference between him and Coleridge that the latter so often suspected; for Wordsworth did "treat man as man—a subject of eye, ear, touch, and taste, in contact with external nature," and contrary to Coleridge's opinion, not "informing the senses from the mind," but "compounding a mind out of the senses!"<sup>1</sup>

Thus, according to Mr. Beatty, Wordsworth's real attitude was the exact opposite of the intention attributed to him by Coleridge. The implication is, I suppose, that Wordsworth showed his independence and refused to bow to Coleridge's dictation. He did compound a mind out of the senses; whereas it had been his friend's desire that he inform the senses from the mind. But the quotation does not suggest that Coleridge dictated to Wordsworth. Coleridge refers to "the plan laid out, and I believe, partly suggested by me, etc." The ideas were Wordsworth's own, either in their origin or by adoption. Indeed, he employed in *The Prelude* words practically equivalent in meaning to the conviction ascribed to him by his fellow-poet:

The mind is lord and master—outward sense  
The obedient servant of her will.<sup>2</sup>

Thus we have no reason to doubt the truth of Coleridge's assertion that Wordsworth, according to his own intention, was not to "compound a mind out of the senses," but to inform "the senses from the mind."

A large amount of material in *The Prelude* seems to be in keeping with this intention. The poem contains many non-Hartleian passages which I have no space to quote. The student in search of such addi-

<sup>1</sup> P. 108.

<sup>2</sup> XII, 222-23.

tional evidence should refer to Mr. S. F. Gingerich's *Essays in the Romantic Poets* (New York, 1924) for a careful analysis which sharply contrasts with the interpretation that Mr. Beatty gives to both *The Prelude* and *The Excursion*.

I wish to call attention to one passage, however, which would be especially difficult to reconcile with a naturalistic philosophy. In the concluding lines of *The Prelude*, Wordsworth announces that he will teach men the divinity of human faculties; he will

Instruct them how the mind of man becomes  
A thousand times more beautiful than the earth  
On which he dwells, above this frame of things. . . .  
In beauty exalted, as it is itself  
Of quality and fabric more divine.<sup>1</sup>

If the mind is a "thousand times" more beautiful than the earth, if the spiritual faculties are immeasurably more divine than the external world, must there not be some internal, supersensuous mode of receiving God into one's soul? We know, in fact, that the poet recognized such endogenous spiritual growth. He affirmed his belief that:

The law of order is a Sentiment  
Inherent in the mind.<sup>2</sup>

Surely Wordsworth means that the "law of order" is innate. In the light of this declaration, we are prepared to reconcile the foregoing quotation from *The Prelude* with the following lines from the *Recluse*, written in 1800:

Beauty—a living Presence of the earth,  
Surpassing the most fair ideal Forms  
Which craft of delicate Spirits hath composed  
From earth's materials—waits upon my steps  
Pitches her tents before me as I move,  
An hourly neighbor.

Thus Wordsworth declares that the beauty of the earth surpasses "the most fair ideal Forms" that the mind of man can construct from "earth's materials." Unless the poet's viewpoint had altered, therefore, he believed that the thousand-fold superiority of the mind must not be due to any reshaping of the stuff of sensation. This superiority, like the "law of order," must be transcendental in origin. Probably Wordsworth's great tribute to the mind and disparagement of the

<sup>1</sup> XIV, 448-54.

<sup>2</sup> De Selincourt, *op. cit.*, p. 593, ll. 34-35.

external world are in harmony with his previous declaration that "forms and images," in contrast with mystical intuitions, represent the "very littleness of life."

I do not mean to argue that Wordsworth was uninfluenced by Hartley. But Mr. Gingerich's quotations from *The Prelude*, nearly all of which may be found substantially unaltered in the early manuscript version published by De Selincourt, show that the poet's devotion to Hartley, even at this stage, had its decided qualifications.

This interpretation of *The Prelude* is reinforced by the evidence provided by Coleridge's reception of the poem. It is important to remember that from the first Wordsworth was addressing his lines to his friend. The title-page of the manuscript version (MS B in De Selincourt's classification) bore the inscription, "Poem: Title not yet fixed upon by William Wordsworth Addressed to S. T. Coleridge." Direct references to Coleridge within the body of the poem indicate that Wordsworth kept his fellow-poet in mind. He would, therefore, have taken particular pains to convey his true meaning to Coleridge. On January 7, 1807, Wordsworth finished reading *The Prelude* to his friend. Coleridge was free to ask questions and to discuss the philosophical substance of the poem. There must have been some discussion of this sort. On the night when the reading was finished, Coleridge composed his poem *To William Wordsworth*, which records the impression which *The Prelude* left upon his mind. Thus he summarizes Wordsworth's theme:

Theme hard as high!  
Of smiles spontaneous, and mysterious fears . . . .  
Of tides obedient to external force,  
And currents *self-determined*, as might seem,  
Or by some *inner Power*; of moments awful,  
Now in thy *inner life*, and now abroad,  
When power streamed from thee, and thy soul received  
The light reflected, as light bestowed. . . .  
Then (last strain)  
Of Duty, *chosen Laws controlling choice*,  
Action and Joy! [My italics.]

Thus Coleridge understood *The Prelude* to set forth doctrine at variance with Hartleianism. The phrase "chosen laws controlling choice" contrasts with Hartley's necessitarianism, and the preceding lines con-

flict with Hartley's belief in the exclusive origin of all mental states in sensation. The phrase "currents self-determined" might be interpreted to mean:

The mind appears to carry on entirely upon its own fund without the aid of the body, without the intervention of the senses or impression of anything external, acting solely in and upon itself. . . .<sup>1</sup>

But Coleridge contrasts these "currents" with "some inner Power" which not merely in appearance, but actually, operates within the mind. Therefore, this "Power" is not only different from "external force," but is different from currents self-determined; it is supra-personal, transcendental. Thus Coleridge regarded *The Prelude* as a work quite opposed to the main doctrine of associationism. That Coleridge misunderstood Wordsworth so entirely is incredible, because every opportunity existed to avoid misapprehension.

Soon after finishing *The Prelude*, Wordsworth wrote this tribute to the child in the *Ode on the Intimations of Immortality*:

Thou Philosopher, who yet dost keep  
Thy heritage, thou Eye among the blind,  
That, deaf and silent, read'st the eternal deep,  
Haunted forever by the eternal mind.

In these lines, surely Wordsworth is expressing not the idea of pre-existence, but the idea that some truth is to be gained by intuition. If a child by reading the "eternal deep, haunted forever by the eternal mind," attains to truth that makes him the "best" of philosophers, the truth must be intuitive; for older individuals have all the evidence of their wider experience and their much more advanced reason at their disposal, yet they are far blinder than the child. Upon the basis of Hartley's principles one would expect increasing understanding as the individual matures; yet Wordsworth announces that the contrary is the fact.

Another poem written in 1806, "Yes, It Was the Mountain Echo," demonstrates Wordsworth's departure from Hartley. The writer definitely and unambiguously states that we hear "voices of two different natures," and that one kind of voice comes "from beyond the grave" and is the voice of God:

<sup>1</sup> Abraham Tucker, *The Light of Nature Pursued* (4 vols., 1765), cited by Mr. Beatty as characteristic associational theory.

Yes, it was the mountain Echo,  
Solitary, clear, profound. . . .

Unsolicited reply  
To a babbling wanderer sent;  
Like her ordinary cry,  
Like—but oh, how different!

Hears not also mortal Life?  
Hear not we, unthinking Creatures!  
Slaves of folly, love, or strife—  
Voices of two different natures?

Have not *we* too?—yes, we have  
Answers, and we know not whence;  
Echoes from beyond the grave,  
Recognized intelligence!

Such rebounds our inward ear  
Catches sometimes from afar—  
Listen, ponder, hold them dear;  
For of God,—of God they are.

This lucid little poem can have only one meaning; if Wordsworth ever accepted Hartley whole-heartedly, he must have altered his philosophy by 1806. We pass beyond the realm of conjecture; these lines obviously mean that one kind of intelligence does not arise from sensation. They are incontrovertible proof that by 1806 Wordsworth did not accept Hartley's fundamental principle, the principle that all mental states originate in sensation.

In 1807 the poet published another un-Hartleian poem, which may have been composed the previous year:

Nor will I praise a cloud, however bright,  
Disparaging Man's gifts, and proper food.  
Grove, isle, with every shape of sky-built dome,  
Though clad in colors beautiful and pure,  
Find in the heart of man no natural home:  
The immortal mind craves objects that endure:  
These cleave to it, from these it cannot roam,  
Nor they from it; their fellowship is secure.<sup>1</sup>

In these words Wordsworth announces that the human mind is linked to eternal things, and that the transitory objects of sensation "find in

<sup>1</sup> *Miscellaneous Sonnets*, No. XII.

the heart of man no natural home." This poem proves that it was the "voice" from God to the "inward ear" that Wordsworth considered as fundamentally important. It would be difficult to construe this passage in favor of associationism.

Mr. Beatty contends that *The Excursion* is genuinely in the tradition of associationism. Nevertheless the poem contains language very strange for a follower of Hartley.

For instance, the Wanderer, addressing himself to God, refers to the "particle divine" that had been in his soul "from childhood up":

By thy grace  
The particle divine remained unquenched;  
And, 'mid the wild weeds of a rugged soil,  
Thy bounty caused to flourish deathless flowers,  
From Paradise transplanted; wintry age  
Impends; the frost will gather round my heart;  
If the flowers wither, I am worse than dead!<sup>1</sup>

This is the language of transcendentalism: "By thy grace/ The particle divine remained unquenched"; "Thy bounty caused to flourish deathless flowers,/ From Paradise transplanted." These words do not indicate that the divine life is gradually constructed out of years of experience. The bounty of God, the divine particle, is present in childhood, and the later years only threaten the sacred flowers with frost. The divine part of man is "transplanted" from Paradise; it is not accumulated, link by link, from the materials of sensation.

An important passage quoted by Mr. Beatty is:

But how acquire  
The inward principle that gives effect  
To outward argument; the passive will  
Meek to admit; the active energy,  
Strong and unbounded to embrace, and firm  
To keep and cherish? How shall men unite  
With self-forgetful tenderness of heart  
An earth-despising dignity of soul?  
Wise is that union, and without it blind!<sup>2</sup>

"This is the problem of *The Excursion*," Mr. Beatty comments. "The attainment of reason . . . is made much more difficult by the multiplex nature of man."<sup>3</sup> Certainly "an earth-despising dignity of soul,"

<sup>1</sup> IV, 50-56.

<sup>2</sup> V, 571-79.

<sup>3</sup> P. 244.



however, is a very odd possession for a devoted follower of Hartley. And certainly a good part of *The Excursion* would indicate that the way to acquire "the inward principle that gives effect to outward argument" is not by reason, but by faith, and by "communion with the invisible world."<sup>1</sup>

An indication of Wordsworth's real state of mind, at the time of writing the later portions of *The Excursion*, is afforded by Coleridge's comments. In 1815 Coleridge was a transcendentalist and quite orthodox. Yet he accepted the newly published poem as a body of truisms. On April 3, 1815, he wrote to Lady Beaumont as follows:

As proofs met me in every part of "The Excursion" that the poet's genius has not flagged, I have sometimes fancied that, having by the conjoint operation of his own experiences, feelings, and reason, *himself* convinced *himself* of truths, which the generality of persons have either taken for granted from their infancy, or, at least, adopted in early life, he has attached all their own depth and weight to doctrines and words, which come almost as truisms or commonplaces to others.<sup>2</sup>

On May 30, Coleridge wrote to Wordsworth, expressing his regret and surprise that *The Excursion* did not contain a specific attack against Locke and the associationists:

I supposed you first to have meditated the faculties of man in the abstract in their correspondence with his sphere of action, and, first in the feeling, touch, and taste, then in the eye, and last in the ear,—to have laid a solid foundation by removing the sandy sophisms of Locke, and the mechanic dogmatists, and demonstrating that the senses were living growths and developments of the mind and spirit, in a much juster as well as higher sense, than the mind can be said to be formed out of the senses.<sup>3</sup>

Until 1812 Coleridge kept in fairly close communication with Wordsworth. After the quarrel of 1812, the association was less frequent, but there were intimate intermediaries like Henry Crabb Robinson and Lamb. It is therefore improbable that Coleridge was unacquainted with Wordsworth's philosophical outlook. Therefore, in supposing that Wordsworth would launch a definite and vigorous attack against Lockian philosophy, he must not have been guided by a mere surmise. He must have known Wordsworth's state of mind, and must have reared his expectations upon this knowledge. The previous letter to Lady Beaumont proves that at least he did not regard the

<sup>1</sup> V, 86.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters*, II, 641-42.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 648.

teaching of *The Excursion* as reprehensible. He was simply disappointed that Wordsworth's anti-Hartleianism did not find a clearer expression.

That Wordsworth did not return to Hartley in his elderly period may be proved by references to his later writings. In so limited a space, proof must be omitted.

This rapid survey of the evidence reveals: (1) that direct proof of Wordsworth's adherence to Hartley has not been advanced; (2) that Coleridge's enormous influence upon Wordsworth was early directed against associationism; (3) that Coleridge, a supreme authority, regarded *The Prelude* and the *Ode on the Intimations of Immortality* as non-Hartleian, and expected that Wordsworth's anti-associationism would find a clear enunciation in *The Excursion*; and (4) that Wordsworth unambiguously expressed transcendental doctrines, quite opposed to Hartleianism. We are forced to conclude that Mr. Beatty has greatly overestimated the influence of associationism upon the Lake poet.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

MELVIN RADER

## THE CANON OF PEELE'S WORKS

OF THE plays and poems included by Dyce and Bullen in their editions of Peele's works we have direct evidence of Peele's authorship of all but seven. Of these seven pieces, one, *The Battle of Alcazar*, is accepted by everybody today as Peele's; two, *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes* and "The Merry Ballet of the Hawthorn Tree," are certainly not by Peele; two, "The Gardener's Speech" and "The Molecatcher's Speech," are probably not by Peele; one, "The Hermit's Speech," may be Peele's; and one, the so-called "Sonnet," appended to *Polyhymnia*, is almost certainly not.

*The Battle of Alcazar* is an anonymous play. It was so listed in all the play lists, biographical dictionaries, and dramatic bibliographies from Rogers and Ley in 1656 to Bliss's edition of Wood's *Athenae* in 1813. In the meantime, however, Malone had conjectured the author to be George Peele. On the title-page of his copy of the play, now in the Bodleian,<sup>1</sup> appears this note in his handwriting, "This play, I believe, was written by George Peele." It is not possible to date this conjecture; but, since the notes on Peele in his copy of Langbaine, now also in the Bodleian,<sup>2</sup> do not mention the play at all, we may conclude that he made it toward the end of his life. He died in 1812.

Malone's conjecture was announced by an anonymous writer in the *London Magazine*, X (1824), 62. Who the writer was we do not know. Dyce apparently knew, but he does not say. Whoever he was, he was certainly well informed; indeed, I suspect from certain parallels with the account of Peele in Bliss's edition of Wood that he was Bliss himself. Dyce, who was in close touch with Bliss, and who was, of course, also familiar with Malone's researches, reprinted the play as Peele's in each of his three editions—1828, 1829, and 1861. In this opinion he is followed by Bullen and by all later critics.

The evidence upon which Malone based his conjecture does not appear. Apparently it was a brilliant guess. It was confirmed by Dyce, who pointed out that six lines from the play appear over Peele's

<sup>1</sup> Bodl. Mal. 163.

<sup>2</sup> Bodl. Mal. 129-32.

name in *England's Parnassus* (1600).<sup>1</sup> We may be sure that this point had escaped Malone; had he known of it he would certainly have given the reference. This evidence is, of course, not conclusive, for several of the passages in the book are wrongly assigned; in this instance, however, we have no reason to suppose that the editor was wrong. The evidence is at least presumptive. Dyce also listed some striking parallel passages from Peele's other writings.<sup>2</sup> The strongest, though most intangible, evidence in favor of Peele's authorship, however, is to be found in the mannerisms of diction, phrasing, imagery, and meter which the piece displays. But there is no need to develop these arguments further, for the play is today accepted by everybody as Peele's.

The other play, *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes*, is accepted by nobody; and it, too, may be disposed of quite shortly. It was first assigned to Peele by Dyce, who, in his supplementary volume of 1839, reprinted it as Peele's on the ground that "on the title-page of a copy of this drama, a manuscript note in a very old hand attributes it to Peele; and, I have no doubt, rightly."<sup>3</sup> He included it also in the final edition of 1861. Dyce adduces no further evidence to support his opinion. The copy of the play to which he refers is unfortunately not known.

The first person to dissent from this view was, I believe, Corser, who in 1869 says, "We rather hesitate in giving the authorship to Peele."<sup>4</sup> Corser, however, gives no reasons for his view. Laemmerhirt, in his monograph on Peele (Rostock, 1882), agrees with Dyce and lists a number of so-called "parallel" passages to support his opinion. These, however, may be dismissed altogether, for, as Bullen rightly says, they "will not impress English readers."<sup>5</sup> Bullen himself doubts Peele's authorship, but includes the play nevertheless in his edition of Peele.

The amazing feature of the story is that Dyce should have been misled even for a moment. For once one of the greatest of English editors appears to have been caught napping. It may be confidently said that not a single feature of the play suggests Peele even remotely.

<sup>1</sup> Dyce, *Peele* (1861), p. 340.

<sup>2</sup> Dyce, *Peele* (1861), pp. 340-41.

<sup>3</sup> Dyce, *Peele* (1839), p. 2 n.

<sup>4</sup> *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica*, Part IV (1869), 407.

<sup>5</sup> Bullen, *Peele*, I (1888), xlii n.

The lumbering meter, the use of dialect words, the archaic vocabulary, the abundance of grammatical inversions, the curious tendency to repeat the subject by a personal pronoun—these peculiarities point, not to Peele, but to some older writer belonging to the generation preceding his. On this all the critics are today agreed.

"The Merry Ballet of the Hawthorn Tree" may be dismissed even more summarily. It was first assigned to Peele by Dyce who included it in his second edition of Peele (1829) on the ground that the manuscript<sup>1</sup> was signed "G. Peele" in a seventeenth-century hand.<sup>2</sup> He reprinted it again in the 1861 edition, and is followed as usual by Bullen in 1888. Dyce, however, says, "That Peele was really the author of it, I think very doubtful." Bullen agrees.<sup>3</sup>

Again we find nothing in the piece to suggest Peele. It is sufficient to say that the verse is crude and clumsy, whereas Peele's, however colorless it may be, is always smooth. As for the signature, it is surely strange that neither Ritson, who reprinted the poem in 1790,<sup>4</sup> nor Evans, who reprinted it in 1810,<sup>5</sup> appears to have noticed it.

We come then to "The Speeches at Theobald's." These consist of three pieces. The first, "The Hermit's Speech," is in verse; the other two, "The Gardener's Speech" and "The Molecatcher's Speech," are in prose. They were addressed to the queen on May 10, 1591, on the occasion of her visit to Burghley at Theobald's, where he was living in temporary retirement. The occasion is described by Nichols.<sup>6</sup>

These pieces have an interesting and curious history. "The Hermit's Speech" was first printed by Collier in 1831<sup>7</sup> from a manuscript in his possession. "The whole piece," he says, "is in the poet's handwriting [i.e., Peele's] and his initials, G. P., are subscribed at the end." At this date Collier did not know of the other two speeches. These later came into his possession, and he loaned them to Dyce (but apparently not "The Hermit's Speech") with the suggestion that they also were in Peele's hand. Dyce, accepting without question Collier's statement with regard to the handwriting, reprinted all three as Peele's

<sup>1</sup> Brit. Mus. MSS. Cotton. Vesp. A. XXV, ff. 163-64.

<sup>2</sup> Dyce, *Peele*, II (1829), 256.

<sup>4</sup> Ritson, *Ancient Songs* (1790), p. 146.

<sup>3</sup> Bullen, *Peele*, II (1888), 370 n.

<sup>5</sup> Evans, *Old Ballads*, I (1810), 342.

<sup>6</sup> Nichols, *Progr. Elis.*, III (1823), 74.

<sup>7</sup> Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Po.*, I (1831), 283-85.

in the supplementary volume of 1839 and again in 1861. As usual he is followed by Bullen in 1888.

The three manuscripts themselves after passing through the hands of Mr. Frederic Ouvry finally reached the British Museum, where they now are.<sup>1</sup>

It may be said at once that the two prose pieces are *not* in the same handwriting as the verse piece, and further that they are not in Peele's hand. Mr. Bond has claimed them for Lyly, probably with good reason. "No one," he says, "really familiar with Lyly's work will question his authorship."<sup>2</sup> And, indeed, they do unmistakably suggest Lyly or, at any rate, someone writing in his manner. I think there can be no doubt that Peele was not the author. They are written in prose, a form which Peele employed in none of his other court pieces; probably verse came to him more easily. Furthermore, the style is euphuistic; and euphuism was a mannerism which, so far as we know, Peele never affected. Finally it may be said that none of the general stylistic features of these pieces point to Peele in any way.

"The Hermit's Speech," which is in verse, must be examined separately. Collier stated in 1831 that the manuscript was in Peele's handwriting and that it was signed with the initials "G. P." The official cataloguer of the British Museum says, "The first statement is clearly incorrect; and the initials have now been torn away, probably because they were a modern forgery not able to bear examination." And knowing as we do that the manuscript passed through Collier's hands, we are predisposed to believe this statement. Dr. Greg makes this comment,

On a careful scrutiny I agree that it is improbable that the writing is Peele's, but the question is by no means a simple one, and I cannot feel quite the same confidence as the official cataloguer in answering it. As to the subscription, "Finis. G. P." having been deliberately torn away, there is I think no doubt possible. At the point where it should stand a strip of paper has clearly been removed, and it is significant that, whereas the tear has taken with it the beginnings of four lines of the text, there is no indication in Collier's print that these lines were at that time defective.<sup>3</sup>

We may, therefore, dismiss the so-called "signature" from the evidence.

<sup>1</sup> Brit. Mus. MSS. Egerton, 2623, No. 10, ff. 15, 17.

<sup>2</sup> Bond, *Lyly*, I (1902), 519-20.

<sup>3</sup> *Rev. Eng. Studies*, I (1925), 453. I am indebted to this article for much of the information given above with regard to these three pieces.

The question of the handwriting is at best doubtful. One inclines, of course, to follow Dr. Greg in a matter of this sort; but unfortunately Dr. Greg is not certain. There is a further point, however, that no one has noticed. I find that the general mannerisms of spelling characteristic of this piece differ materially from those in Peele's manuscript of *Anglorum Ferie*.<sup>1</sup> In this manuscript, and indeed in the contemporary reprints of Peele's other writings, there is a persistent tendency to the use of a final mute *e* in nouns and adjectives. In the manuscript in question, however, this mannerism is not apparent. In the first thirty lines of the *Anglorum Ferie* manuscript there are no less than forty-four instances of this spelling; in the first thirty lines of "The Hermit's Speech" there are only twenty-three. This no doubt is an argument that should not be pressed too far; but it has a certain weight, and in so far it would incline one to think that the handwriting is not Peele's.

However, the question still remains: Was this piece written by Peele? Ward thinks it was,<sup>2</sup> and Mr. Bond agrees.<sup>3</sup> It displays, so far as I can find, no indisputable parallels with the other writings of Peele; but, on the other hand, the broad stylistic qualities of the poem—the easy flow of the verse, the sweetness of the phrasing, the tendency to wordiness, the general openness of texture characteristic of it—do undoubtedly suggest Peele. Unfortunately there is no corroborative evidence of any sort. Our knowledge of Peele's life is, of course, very meager, but certainly we know nothing to suggest that in 1591 Peele was on such terms at court as to warrant the conclusion that he would be called in to devise such a show as this. My conclusion, therefore, is that the piece may conceivably be Peele's but that we have no reliable evidence either way. In any event, the burden of proof rests upon those who would include it in the canon. It may be added that it would probably not have occurred to anyone to assign the poem to Peele had not Collier in his irresponsible fashion done so in 1831.

A more interesting piece is the so-called "Sonnet" appended to *Polyhymnia* (1590). This is deservedly one of the best-known shorter poems in English; and it appears, as it should, in every anthology of

<sup>1</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 21432.

<sup>2</sup> Ward, *Eng. Dram. Lit.*, I (1899), 364.

<sup>3</sup> Bond, *Lilly*, I (1902), 385.



English verse from *The Golden Treasury* to *The Week-End Book*. The poem was sung before the queen by Mr. Hales, the lutanist, on behalf of Sir Henry Lea, the queen's champion, on November 17, 1590. The occasion was a tournament arranged to celebrate the aged champion's giving up of his office to the Earl of Cumberland. There is a contemporary account of the ceremony in Segar's *Honour* (1602).<sup>1</sup> The following is the quarto text:

## A SONET

His Golden lockes, Time hath to Siluer turn'd,  
 O Time too swift, ð Swiftnesse neuer ceasing:  
 His Youth gainst Time and Age hath euer spurn'd  
 But spurn'd in vain, Youth waineth by increasing.  
     Beauty, Strength, Youth, are flowers, but fading seen,  
     Dutie, Faith, Loue are roots, and euer greene.

His Helmet now, shall make a hiue for Bees,  
 And Louers Sonets, turn'd to holy Psalmes:  
 A man at Armes must now serue on his knees,  
 And feede on praiers, which are Age his almes.  
     But though from Court to Cottage he depart,  
     His Saint is sure of his vnspotted heart.

And when he saddest sits in homely Cell,  
 Heele teache his Swaines this Carroll for a Song.  
*Blest be the heartes that wish my Soueraigne well,*  
*Curst be the soules that thinke her any wrong.*  
     Goddesse, allow this aged man his right,  
     To be your Beads-man now, that was your Knight.

Peele's *Polyhymnia* is a poem written in characteristically flabby blank verse and describing in detail the tournament itself and the various persons who took part in it. At the end of the quarto appears the "Sonet." The poem was, therefore, for a long time accepted unquestionably as Peele's. Dyce had no doubt about it. "That Peele wrote the sonnet in question," he says, "there can be no doubt; and that he was the inventor and director of the shows exhibited . . . I think quite as certain."<sup>2</sup> In this opinion he is followed by Bullen and the anthologists. There is, however, very little evidence for the first statement, namely, that Peele was the author; and none at all

<sup>1</sup> Bk. III, chap. 54, p. 197.

<sup>2</sup> Dyce, *Peele* (1861), p. 336.

for the second, namely, that Peele was the director of the shows exhibited.

Mr. Bond claims the poem for Lyly. In support of his claim he cites the following parallel passages:

*Euphues*— "for louers Sonettes, Dauids Psalmes"

"We thinke it as great mirth to sing Psalmes, as you melody to chaunt Sonnets"

*Endymion*—"My vnspotted thoughts"

"vnspotted in his truth"

"without spotte"

*Campaspe*—"Bees to make their hiues in Soldiers helmets"

*Euphues*—"The Bees haue made their hiues in the soldiers helmets"

*Endymion*—"Thou that layest down with golden locks, shall not awake until they be turned to siluer hairs"<sup>1</sup>

Of these parallels, one at least is certainly striking. Indeed, it does seem most unlikely that the fine image of the helmet and the beehive should occur independently to two poets; and Lyly uses it at least twice. There is, however, always the possibility of plagiarism.<sup>2</sup> The other parallels do not appear to be important.

Sir Edmund Chambers applies the term "wanton" to this conjecture of Mr. Bond's.<sup>3</sup> However that may be, one is certainly justified in receiving Mr. Bond's conjectures with reserve, since he surely passed all limits in his wholesale claims for Lyly among the anonymous and doubtful lyrics of the Elizabethan age.

Other authors have been suggested: the Earl of Essex by Evans,<sup>4</sup> and Sir Henry Lea himself by Sir Edmund Chambers.<sup>5</sup> But, as it cannot be said that a clear case has been made out for anyone, these speculations need not concern us here.

Whoever the author may be, he is almost certainly not Peele. It is surely strange that the "Sonet" does not appear at all in the contemporary manuscript of *Polyhymnia* now at St. John's College, Oxford; that the three contemporary manuscripts of the poem<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bond, *Lyly*, I (1902), 410.

<sup>2</sup> Or the two poets may have used the same source. Bond, *Lyly*, II (1902), 550, points out that the image of the helmet and the bees had already been used in Alciati's *Emblems*.

<sup>3</sup> Chambers, *Elis. Stage*, III (1923), 404.

<sup>4</sup> Evans, *Old Ballads*, IV (1810), 48.

<sup>5</sup> Chambers, *Elis. Stage*, III (1923), 404.

<sup>6</sup> Bodl. MSS. Rawl. Po. 148, f. 19; Brit. Mus. MSS. Stowe, 276, f. 2; Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 33963, f. 109.

make no reference to Peele; that Dowland reprints the song in his *First Booke of Songes or Ayres* (1597), but mentions no author; that Segar in his account of the ceremony quotes the poem, but does not mention either Peele or *Polyhymnia*. It may be noted further that the Segar version is the only one that is composed throughout in the first person, "My golden locks, etc." This fact would suggest that we have here the original version, for, of course, it is Sir Henry Lea himself who speaks. If this be so, we may well ask why it is that the version in the Peele quarto, like those in the manuscripts and Dowland, should be written in the third person, thus representing what is apparently a modified text.

The fact that the poem appears in the *Polyhymnia* quarto really proves nothing, for, as Mr. Bond has pointed out,<sup>1</sup> the two poems could not in any event have been written together. The "Sonnet" clearly was written for the occasion; Peele's poem *Polyhymnia*, however, since it describes in detail all that happened, must have been written afterward. Furthermore Peele's poem ends in the middle of sig. B4r and is followed by the word *Finis*. The "Sonnet" is printed by itself on B4v. One can easily account for its appearance in the book as being a memorable part of the ceremony which the book celebrates.

Furthermore, as I have already said, *pace* Dyce, there is no reason to suppose that Peele was at this time so closely connected with the court as to suggest that he would be commissioned to write the song for the occasion.

Finally, it may be said that the internal evidence is wholly against Peele's authorship. The poem displays not one of Peele's mannerisms of diction, phrase, imagery, or meter. Indeed, the evidence here is all the other way. The poem is, in fact, far too good for Peele. One can imagine almost any one of the court poets writing it—Essex, Oxford, even Lea himself—but not George Peele. The poem has a compactness of expression, a rightness of phrase, and, above all, a sustained adequacy of treatment that one constantly finds in the work of the court poets and that one constantly misses in that of Peele. Among the many poetic qualities that Peele lacked was the power to maintain a poem, whether long or short, at a consistent level to the very end. And if he did indeed write the "Sonnet," it stands unique in this

<sup>1</sup> Bond, *Lily*, I (1902), 517.

respect among his writings. The weight of the evidence, therefore, is against Peele's authorship.

In conclusion I should like to mention two minor points which may cause trouble to students of Peele. In his edition of Wood's *Athenae*<sup>1</sup> Bliss gives among the poetical miscellanies containing pieces by Peele, *The Paradise of Dainty Devices* (1576) and *Bel-vedere* (1600). The inclusion of the first of these was evidently a slip, for in 1576 Peele was still an undergraduate at Oxford; and in his copy of his edition of Wood, now in the Bodleian,<sup>2</sup> Bliss has himself drawn his pen through the entry. The *Bel-vedere* reference is to be found also in the *London Magazine* article already referred to. It was copied by Dyce and also, strange to say, by M. Cheffaud, whose brilliant monograph on Peele<sup>3</sup> is by far the best study of the poet that has appeared. It is true that in the Preface to the 1600 edition of *Bel-vedere* Peele's name appears in the list of contributors; but up to the present time no one has succeeded in identifying any of the pieces contained in the book as Peele's. It may be added that the list of contributors does not appear in the 1610 edition of the book.

When we have cleared away these spurious and doubtful pieces, we have left a homogeneous and coherent body of work, the product of a single mind and of consistent effort. The plays, it is true, present an extraordinary range in matter and in form, even for an Elizabethan dramatist. But the whole body of work—plays and poems together—displays many common features, features which are individual to Peele and which it is by no means difficult to determine and to fix. With this as a basis I believe we can proceed to the larger and more important problem of determining Peele's share in the writing of our early drama, and thus ultimately of defining, to this extent at least, the scope and the boundaries of the work of Shakespeare himself.

T. LARSEN

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
VANCOUVER, CANADA

<sup>1</sup> Wood, *Athenae Oxon.* (ed. Bliss, 1813), Vol. I, col. 690.

<sup>2</sup> Bodl. MS. top. Oxon. c. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Cheffaud, *Peele* (Paris, 1913), p. 190.



COLERIDGE'S INTIMATIONS OF IMMORTALITY  
FROM PROCLUS

---

WORDSWORTH dated his great *Ode* 1803-6. He told Miss Isabella Fenwick in 1843 that two years at least had passed between the writing of the first four sections and the remaining part. It is known, however, that the date 1803 is wrong; the *Ode* was begun in 1802. Many of Wordsworth's statements to Miss Fenwick are open to question, owing to the great length of time that had passed since the events of which he told, and to his advanced age. I believe it probable that he was wrong about the time at which he continued the *Ode*, that he wrote sections V-VIII in the spring of 1802, and that the thought of these sections came to him from conversations of Coleridge with Dorothy and Wordsworth just following Coleridge's return to the Lake Country in the spring of that year. These sections with their doctrine of pre-existence contain the chief thought of the poem and their genesis is therefore of interest.

In March, 1802, Coleridge returned to Keswick after an absence of about four months. During this and the preceding months his correspondence shows him to have been worried and depressed. He lost little time in renewing his intimacy with the Wordsworths, walking over to their home at Grasmere Friday, March 18, and remaining until Sunday. Dorothy in her *Journal* tells of Coleridge's arrival and stay:

Poor C., I did not wish for, or expect him, it rained so. . . . Coleridge came in. His eyes were a little swollen with the wind. I was much affected by the sight of him, he seemed half-stupefied. William came in soon after. Coleridge went to bed late, and William and I sate up till four o'clock. A letter from Sara sent by Mary. They disputed about Ben Jonson. My spirits were agitated very much. *Saturday*.— . . . When I awoke the whole vale was covered with snow. William and Coleridge walked. . . . William read *The Pedlar*. Talked about various things—christening the children, etc. etc. Went to bed at twelve o'clock.

The conversation of Coleridge and Wordsworth on this first meeting for months, starting apparently with Ben Jonson and including "christening the children" (Derwent and Hartley,<sup>1</sup> I suppose), would be of even more interest if we could know the details of the "various things" they discussed. They could not have failed to touch upon the deep dejection of Coleridge at the loss of his youthful imagination. But Dorothy and William had (as shown by her *Journal*) been reading Ben Jonson's poems diligently of late. One of these, that on the death of his infant daughter, remained in Dorothy's mind so that she wrote it out in her *Journal* for February 11; I give it as found in the *Journal*, with omissions and inaccuracies that show she quoted from memory:

Here lies to each her parents ruth,  
Mary the daughter of their youth.  
At six months' end she parted hence,  
In safety of her innocence.

Anyone familiar with Coleridge's thoughts and habits of mind can readily conceive what trains of theological and philosophical discourse this would have started—enough to last well into the night and be renewed the next day.<sup>2</sup> It would certainly have reminded all three friends of the similar poem written by Coleridge a few years earlier; I quote from a letter dated April 8, 1799, written to his wife on learning of the death of their little son, Berkeley: "Ah, my poor Berkeley! A few weeks ago an Englishman desired me to write an epitaph on an infant who had died before christening. While I wrote it, my heart with a deep misgiving turned my thoughts homewards.

<sup>1</sup> Coleridge's concern about Hartley's christening is shown in a note in *Anima Poetae* for 1802-3, p. 40: "Dozing, dreamt of Hartley as at his christening—how, as he was asked who redeemed him, and was to say, 'God the Son,' he went on humming and hawing." etc. Hartley has many connections with the thought of the ode; cf. *Anima Poetae*, p. 96: "To deduce instincts from obscure recollections of a pre-existing state—I have often thought of it. 'Ey' I have said, when I have seen certain tempers and actions in Hartley, 'that is I in my future state.'"

<sup>2</sup> Hazlitt in his essay on Coleridge says: "Scarce a thought can pass through the mind of man, but its sound has at some time or other passed over his head with rustling pinions. On whatever question or author you speak, he is prepared to take up the theme with advantage—from Peter Abelard down to Thomas Moore, from the subtlest metaphysics to the politics of the *Courier*. There is no man of genius in whose praise he descants, but the critic seems to stand above the author and 'what in him is weak, to strengthen, what is low to raise and support.'" See *Collected Works*, ed. Waller and Glover, IV (1902), 213-14.



## ON AN INFANT, WHO DIED BEFORE ITS CHRISTENING

Be rather than be *call'd* a Child of God!  
 Death whisper'd. With assenting Nod  
 Its head upon the Mother's breast  
 The baby bow'd, and went without demur  
 Of the kingdom of the blest  
 Possessor, not Inheritor.<sup>1</sup>

It refers to the second question in the Church Catechism."

In this connection the two friends could not fail to remember and bring into the discussion the finest lines in Jonson's splendid *Ode to the Immortal Memory and Friendship of that Noble Pair Sir Lucius Cary and Sir H. Morison*:

It is not growing like a tree  
 In bulk doth make men better be;  
 Or standing long an oak, three hundred year,  
 To fall a log at last, dry, bald, and sear;  
     A lily of a day  
     Is fairer far, in May,  
 Although it fall and die that night,  
 It was the plant and flower of light . . .  
     He leap'd the present age,  
     Possest with holy rage,  
 To see that bright eternal day.

Within a week, with Coleridge's talk still fresh in mind, on childish innocence, the dulness and dejection of later years, infant baptism and Derwent and Hartley, Wordsworth was to start his own *Ode*, in cadence and phrasing reminiscent of this of Jonson, on the glory and radiance of youthful innocence; and Coleridge a few days later was to write his own *Ode on Dejection*, looking back with regret on his youth. Wordsworth, it must be remembered, had disliked such complicated verse forms as odes and sonnets, but Jonson's fine verse was

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Anima Poetae* (1802-3), p. 45: "Something to me delicious in the thought that one who dies a baby presents to the glorified Saviour and Redeemer that same sweet face of infancy which he blessed when on earth, and sanctified with a kiss, and solemnly pronounced to be the type and sacrament of regeneration." Coleridge's objection to infant baptism is connected with this thought; Hazlitt's account in his *On First Meeting with Poets* is well known: "He told me in confidence (going along) that he should have preached two sermons before he accepted the situation at Shrewsbury, one on Infant Baptism, the other on the Lord's Supper, shewing that he could not administer either, which would have effectively disqualified him for the object in view."

to dispel the prejudice for a time, as the reading of Milton's sonnets two months later was to start him writing his own greatest sonnets.<sup>1</sup>

Coleridge left on Sunday. On Monday, a rainy day, with William "very poorly," two letters came from Sara and one from "poor Annette." "We talked a good deal about C. and other interesting things. We resolved to see Annette, and that Wm. should go to Mary." On Tuesday: "We talked about C. Wm. repeated the poem ['The Cuckoo'] to me. I left him there, and in 20 minutes he came in, rather tired with attempting to write. He is now reading Ben Jonson." The following Friday, March 25, Dorothy records: "While I was getting into bed, he wrote *The Rainbow*." For Saturday: "A divine morning. At breakfast William wrote part of an ode." Thus these two poems (*The Rainbow*, as Dorothy calls it, and part of the *Ode*), which are really part of one poem, were produced together one evening and the following morning, just a week after Coleridge's visit. (It is worth noting that Wordsworth, by his process of recollecting in tranquillity, often let just about a week pass between the first impulse to a poem and the time of putting it into verse.) Only a portion of the *Ode* was produced at this time, and we may feel pretty sure that this was taken to Coleridge when Dorothy and William went to Keswick on Sunday, April 4. Dorothy writes in her *Journal*: "We drove by gig to Water End. I walked down to Coleridge's. Mrs. Calvert came to Greta Bank to tea. William walked down with Mrs. Calvert, and repeated his verses to them."

Now Sunday, April 4, is just the date of Coleridge's *Ode to Dejection*. Its substance, its form, and its language are such that it seems part of the same *Ode* that Wordsworth had been working on after his talk with Coleridge. Both poets express regret that they have lost the glamor that clothed all things in childhood. Coleridge, in a letter to W. Sotheby dated July 19, describes his poem as "written during that dejection to Wordsworth"; the passage he quotes first in this letter will strike the reader as almost a duplicate of Wordsworth's first lines:

<sup>1</sup> This is Wordsworth's first ode; in it he does not, of course, adopt the strict Pindaric form. Hazlitt remarks in his essay on Wordsworth: "The Ode and Epode, the Strophe and Antistrophe he laughs to scorn." For his poem "To the Daisy," written at this time, the commentators note that Wordsworth adopted the metrical scheme of another poem contained in Jonson's *Underwoods*, *Eupheme*. As to the sonnet form, Wordsworth wrote to Landor April 21, 1822: "I used to think it egregiously absurd . . . . Many years ago [May 21, 1802, according to Dorothy's *Journal*] my sister happened to read to me the sonnets of Milton, which I could at that time repeat. . . . In the course of the afternoon I produced three sonnets and soon after many others."

Yes, dearest poet, yes!  
 There was a time when tho' my path was rough,  
 The joy within me dallied with distress,  
 And all misfortunes were but as the stuff  
 Whence fancy made me dreams of happiness:  
 For Hope grew round me, like the climbing vine,  
 And fruit, and foliage, not my own, seemed mine.  
 But now afflictions bow me down to earth:  
 Nor care I, that they rob me of my mirth,  
 But oh! each visitation  
 Suspends what nature gave me at my birth,  
 My shaping spirit of Imagination.

It may be asked just what part of his *Ode* Wordsworth had written at this time; probably he had paused at the question ending the first four sections. These sections form a reasonably complete poem in themselves, which may be summarized as follows: There was a time when the beauty of nature was enhanced by a gleam that now for me has vanished. There is the same beauty in nature now as before, but the radiance is gone; I can still, however, see other young creatures with the same joy I used to feel, and can understand their feelings and share them by sympathy. But, the four sections end,

Whither is fled the visionary gleam?  
 Where is it now, the glory and the dream?

It will be noted that thus far we have no philosophy of pre-existence to account for the youthful radiance; Wordsworth merely feels the loss and asks for an explanation. The philosophical answer is still to come.

That the poem had reached this point is shown by lines from Coleridge's twin ode which echoes Wordsworth's question and gives a partial answer only, that the radiance comes not from outer phenomena, but from an inner joy:

O Wordsworth! we receive but what we give,  
 And in our life alone does Nature live;  
 Ours is her wedding garment, ours her shroud!

. . . . .  
 Ah! from the soul itself must issue forth,  
 A light, a glory, a fair luminous cloud  
 Enveloping the earth!  
 And from the soul itself must there be sent

A sweet and powerful voice, of its own birth,  
 Of all sweet sounds the life and element!  
 O pure of heart! thou need'st not ask of me  
*What* this strong music in the soul may be?  
 What and wherein it doth exist,  
 This light, this glory, this fair luminous mist,  
 This beautiful and beauty-making Power.  
 Joy, blameless poet! Joy that ne'er was given  
 Save to the pure, and in their purest hour.

Here matters rest for a while; but neither poet was likely to stop without a more complete answer as to the origin of the inner joy and the reason for its departure. An answer, if any was to be found, was much more likely to come from the philosopher Coleridge than from Wordsworth; as a matter of fact, Coleridge had already, some years before, found a possible answer in his reading and suggested it in his sonnet on the birth of Hartley, his son. The sonnet was composed during Coleridge's journey homeward from Birmingham on receiving the news of Hartley's birth; I quote from its earlier version:

Oft of some unknown Past such Fancies roll  
 Swift o'er my brain as make the Present seem  
 For a brief moment like a most strange dream  
 When not unconscious that she dreamt, the soul  
 Questions herself in sleep! and some have said  
 We lived ere yet this fleshly robe we wore.  
 O my sweet baby! when I reach my door,  
 If heavy looks should tell me thou art dead  
 (As sometimes through excess of hope I fear)  
 I think that I should struggle to believe  
 Thou wert a spirit, to this nether sphere  
 Sentenc'd for some more venial crime to grieve.

Coleridge appends to the poem this note: "Almost all the followers of Fénelon believe that men are degraded Intelligences who had once existed together in a paradisiacal or perhaps heavenly state." He evidently tried to investigate this Neo-Platonic doctrine further at the time. Hartley was born September 19, 1796; on November 19 Coleridge wrote for John Thelwall to pick up for him in London various books, chiefly of the Neo-Platonists. Heading the list is "Iamblichus, Proclus, Porphyrius, etc., one shilling and sixpence, one little volume."

This is Marsilio Ficino's compendium of excerpts in Latin from

the writers named and others. The book was duly bought, and there Coleridge found many things to interest a "library cormorant," as he describes himself. Now to return to Grasmere and 1802. On May 6 Dorothy makes this very significant entry in her *Journal*: "When we came in we found a magazine, and review, and a letter from Coleridge, verses to Hartley, and Sara H. We read the review, etc. The moon was a perfect boat, a silver boat, when we were out in the evening." I do not know what these verses to Hartley were unless those quoted above; but why were they sent now, nearly six years after they were written? If only we had the letter that went with them I suspect that we should find a disquisition on Neo-Platonism, Proclus, and pre-existence. May 12 Coleridge himself walked over, and they sat up until one o'clock talking. May 14: "We wrote to Coleridge; sent off bread and frocks to the C.'s. Went to bed at half-past eleven. William very nervous. After he was in bed, haunted with altering *The Rainbow*." Evidently the problem of *The Rainbow* and the *Ode* were still occupying the poet's mind; Dorothy's *Journal* shows how restless and disturbed he usually was when working on a poem.

Then, on June 10, comes this: "Coleridge came in with a sack full of books, etc., and a branch of mountain ash." We might conjecture that this sack of books contained some of the Neo-Platonists and hardly in elephant folios; it is several miles from Keswick to Grasmere. Very likely the little Marsilio Ficino was there, that Coleridge had bought soon after Hartley and Fénelon had set him thinking on the possibility of a more radiant realm above from which our spirit descends to the prison-house of this world. Coleridge remained until June 12, and the theme of their conversations is almost told for us by Dorothy the day after their guest left, in a very significant entry: "The full moon (not quite full) was among a company of shady island clouds, and the sky bluer about it than the natural sky blue. William observed that the full moon, above a dark fir grove, is a fine image of the descent of a superior being." This is certainly the beginning of

Trailing clouds of glory do we come  
From God, who is our home.

And at just the right period for Wordsworth's usual incubation comes this, on June 17: "A short letter from Coleridge. William added a little to the *Ode* he is writing." It is pretty clear what this addition

was; but first I must quote from the chapter of Proclus in Marsilio Ficino's excerpts that he and Coleridge must have been discussing:<sup>1</sup> Descensus animae in corpus seiunxit quidem illam a diuinis animis, a quibus intelligentia, et potestate, puritateque implebatur. Coniunxit vero generationi, et naturae, materialibusque rebus a quibus obliuione, et errore, et ignorantia est imbuta.

Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting.

It is now time to examine what ingredients make up sections V-VIII of the *Ode*; they form the philosophical answer to the first four sections, and are made of very interesting material. There is Proclus' doctrine of descent and gradual forgetfulness; there is the full moon trailing clouds of glory like a spirit descending from the skies; there is the account of the "six years' Darling of a pigmy size," i.e., Hartley Coleridge; and there is, strangely enough, Shakespeare's account of man as an actor and the seven ages of man. Hartley and the moon we have already accounted for; but the rest we must find in Proclus, and it is necessary now to give in full the chapter the beginning of which I quoted above. But first must be noted a chapter beginning a few pages earlier (p. 233) with the heading: "Aetates septem planetis septem congruae." This chapter apparently furnished Shakespeare with his account of the seven ages,<sup>2</sup> which he united with the motto of the new Globe Theater into which his company was just moving: "Totus mundus agit histrionem." Of course, Wordsworth mingles the Shakespeare and Proclus both in the seventh section of his *Ode*.

Quomodo anima descendendo varie vestiatur, et rursum purgetur, redeatque vicissim.

Descensus animae in corpus seiunxit quidem illam a diuinis animis, a quibus intelligentia, et potestate, puritateque implebatur, coniunxit vero generationi, et naturae, materialibusque rebus a quibus obliuione, et errore, et ignorantia est imbuta. Nam animae descendenti adnatae sunt ex mundo multiformes vitae, vestesque variae trahentes quidem ipsam in compositionem cadueam, obstantes autem contemplationi separatorum. Oportet igitur animam hinc ad naturam illam peruigilem rectam ducendam, amputare secundas, tertiasque vires descendenti subortas, sicut marino Glauco, herbae, petrae, conchae:

<sup>1</sup> Iamblichus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum. Proclus in Platonis Alcibiadem de Anima, atque Daemone. . . . Lugduni. . . . MDLXXVII, p. 238. Professor J. L. Lowes in *The Road to Xanadu* has recently shown the influence of this little book on some of Coleridge's own poems.

<sup>2</sup> See the *Philological Quarterly*, IV, 4. The following pages of Proclus contain an account of the harmony in immortal souls very like the passage in the last act of *Merchant of Venice*.

cohibere vero impetus extra ferentes. Reminisci rursum rerum separatarum, essentiaeque diuinae, unde est facta descensio, et ad quam omnem vitam contendere decet.<sup>1</sup>

To summarize up to this point: Coleridge, in deep dejection since his return to the Lakes, had been in almost daily communication with the Wordsworths, either personally or by letter. Wordsworth had begun his *Ode* under the influence of Coleridge's dejection and feeling of loss of the buoyancy of childhood. To Wordsworth's questions as to the cause of the change, Coleridge had suggested a philosophical answer might be found in Proclus, and the two had discussed this. Wordsworth had embodied it in sections V-VIII of his *Ode*. Both poets must certainly have questioned whether this pagan doctrine was fitting for a Christian poem; but more of this later.

May we be certain, however, that the parts of the *Ode* dealing with pre-existence (V-VIII) were not added much later, as Wordsworth told Miss Fenwick? As to this, we have several pieces of evidence that seem conclusive. One is to be found in the following strange lines from section VIII:

To whom the grave  
Is but a lonely bed without the sense or sight  
Of day or the warm light,  
A place of thought where we in waiting lie.

These lines were later omitted. Coleridge protested against "the frightful notion of lying awake in the grave." But there can be no question that they were written in the spring of 1802 rather than in 1806 when we read this extraordinary passage from Dorothy's *Journal* for April 29, 1802:

We then went to John's Grove, sate a while at first; afterwards William lay, and I lay, in the trench under the fence—he with his eyes shut, and listening to the waterfalls and the birds. There was no one waterfall above another—it was a sound of waters in the air—the voice of the air. William heard me breathing, and rustling now and then, but we both lay still, and unseen by one another. He thought that it would be so sweet thus to lie in the grave, to hear the peaceful sounds of the earth, and just to know that our dear friends were near. The lake was still; there was a boat out. Silver How reflected with delicate purple and yellowish hues, as I have seen spar; lambs on the island, and running races together by the half-dozen, in the round field near us. The copses greenish, hawthorns green, . . . cottages smoking. As

<sup>1</sup> Vaughan's *The Retreat*, often quoted in connection with the *Ode*, seems to be based on this same chapter, and perhaps the passages in Traherne.



I lay down on the grass, I observed the glittering silver line on the ridge of the backs of the sheep, owing to their situation respecting the sun, which made them look beautiful, but with something of strangeness, like animals of another kind, as if belonging to a more splendid world. . . . I got mullins and pansies. . . .

Surely this passage interweaves inextricably the strange thought of consciousness in the grave, found in the eighth section of the *Ode*, with the lambs and cataracts and the winds from the fields of sleep of the third section and the pansy and gleam of the fourth section; there is no interval of two or four years between. On this bright almost-May morning Dorothy and William were so steeped in Neo-Platonism and pre-existence that even the lambs were Neo-Platonic lambs, with a radiance and a gleam on the "ridges of their backs" brought from some brighter world than this!

Here, too, must be cited Wordsworth's poem "To H. C., Six Years Old." Hartley was six in September, 1802. This little poem is clearly an echo of sections V-VIII of the *Ode*:

O thou! whose fancies from afar are brought;  
 Who of thy words dost make a mock apparel,  
 And fittest to unutterable thought  
 The breeze-like motion and the self-born carol;  
 Thou faery voyager! that dost float  
 In such clear water, that thy boat  
 May rather seem  
 To brood on air than on an earthly stream;  
 Suspended in a stream as clear as sky,  
 Where earth and heaven do make one imagery;  
 O blessed vision! happy child!  
 Thou art so exquisitely wild,  
 I think of thee with many fears  
 For what may be thy lot in future years.

These lines mingle the canoe-moon that we find in Dorothy's *Journal*, in Coleridge, and in Wordsworth, with the Neo-Platonism they discussed as they walked in the bright spring moonlight in May, 1802. "Thy own sweet sky-canoe," says Coleridge in his *Ode*, referring to "My gay and beautiful canoe" in Wordsworth's *Peter Bell*. (Dorothy had been copying *Peter Bell* March 18, 21, and 26.) "The moon was a perfect boat, a silver boat," writes Dorothy on May 6, thinking of both poets as she writes; for the letter had just come from Coleridge with "verses to Hartley."

One more indication that the thought of sections V-VIII was in the poet's mind in 1802. In the splendid sonnet, assigned by all the editors to 1802, beginning

The world is too much with us; late and soon  
Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers:  
Little we see in Nature that is ours

it is still Proclus' doctrine that Wordsworth is putting into verse. Even Proclus himself appears, for he is, without much question, the

Pagan suckled in a creed outworn.

Proclus had been among the last of the great pagan philosophers to make a stand against the overwhelming tide of Christianity. The reference work nearest my hand as I write will serve as well as any, *Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities*: "The efforts of Proclus were directed to the support of paganism in its struggle with the now victorious Christianity, by reducing to a system all the philosophic and religious traditions of antiquity." We may find, too, a few lines below in the sonnet, Glaucus emerging from the sea as in the very chapter from Proclus quoted above; but Proclus' Glaucus has suffered a sea-change into Proteus. The strange sea-growths and conch-shells (*herbae, petrae, conchae*) are the suggestion for Triton's wreathed horn in the next line.<sup>1</sup> It would, however, have been a distinct shock to the unbookish Wordsworth to learn that his pagan Proclus had seen the sea-god rising from the sea not in nature, but in the tenth book of Plato's *Republic*!

As yet, we have left the *Ode* incomplete. It may be asked why it was broken off here<sup>2</sup> and not completed until 1806, as Wordsworth states in the Fenwick notes. There are, I believe, several reasons. One is the increasing demand of other matters on Wordsworth's attention. He was planning for his marriage and for his trip just before the marriage to France to visit Annette; Dorothy's notes are full of references during this time to both Annette and Mary. But the chief reason is the fact that neither Coleridge nor Wordsworth was quite willing to adopt the doctrine of pre-existence as part of his faith. This caused a delay in the process of composition; the philosophical

<sup>1</sup> Dorothy's *Journal* shows that she and her brother were reading Spenser and Milton in May and June, 1802, and these two lines contain echoes of these poets, as the commentators note. The suggestion is from Proclus, the phrasing in part from Spenser and Milton.

<sup>2</sup> The last two sections were quite clearly added later; section IX was probably composed in part in 1802 with the preceding sections, in part at the later date.

basis of the poem must be considered for a while longer. Wordsworth's notes to Miss Fenwick show his doubts:

"To that dream-like vividness and splendor which invests objects of sight in childhood, everyone, I believe, if he would look back, could bear testimony, and I need not dwell upon it here; but having in the poem regarded it as a presumptive evidence of a prior state of existence, I think it right to protest against a conclusion which has given pain to some good and pious persons, that I meant to inculcate such a belief. It is far too shadowy a notion to be recommended to faith as more than an element in our instincts of immortality. . . . Having to wield some of its elements when I was impelled to write this poem on the Immortality of the Soul, I took hold of the notion of pre-existence as having sufficient foundation in humanity for authorising me to make for my purpose the best use of it I could as a poet.

Wordsworth told Aubrey de Vere that he held the belief "with a poetic, not a religious faith." The title *Intimations of Immortality*, which was not used before the edition of 1815, is an after-thought intended to reconcile the paganism of Proclus with the Christian philosophy of those "good and pious persons" to whom Wordsworth refers above.<sup>1</sup>

With the remaining three sections (X-XII) of the *Ode* I am not dealing at present, but am concerned, as was said in the beginning, with the Neo-Platonism of sections V-VIII and its origin. It should be said in conclusion, however, that the last three sections apparently come from a time of renewed intimacy with Coleridge; at such times both poets did their best work. This capstone probably was placed on the towering *Ode* in the period December, 1806, to February, 1807, when Coleridge (and Hartley) came just before Christmas for a visit to Wordsworth in his new home in the farmhouse at Coleorton. Words-

<sup>1</sup> There is perhaps another reason to be found in the fact that Coleridge and Wordsworth were by this time finding themselves not entirely in agreement in their views as to poetry. The passage below, from a letter of Coleridge to Southey, dated July 29, 1802, refers to these views as expressed in the famous Preface; but I believe that what is said applies equally well to the *Ode*. I am not sure what poem is meant in the reference to a poem of 160 lines; *Resolution and Independence* had 147 lines in the edition of 1807. If the *Ode* is meant, this would take us not quite through the ninth section, almost exactly the point suggested by an examination of the thought of the poem: "But I will apprise you of one thing, that although Wordsworth's Preface is half a child of my own brain, and arose out of conversations so frequent that, with few exceptions, we could scarcely either of us, perhaps, positively say which started any particular thought (I am speaking of the Preface as it stood in the second volume) yet I am far from going all lengths with Wordsworth. He has written lately a number of Poems (thirty-two in all), some of them of considerable length (the longest one hundred and sixty lines) the greater number of these, to my feelings, very excellent compositions, but here and there a daring humbleness of language and versification, and a strict adherence to matter of fact, even to prolixity, that startled me. . . . I rather suspect that somewhere or other there is a radical difference in our theoretical opinions respecting poetry."

worth was preparing his poems for publication in the edition of 1807, and of course wished to include the *Ode*. There is an interesting indication that the conversations of the two poets turned again to the discussion of Proclus in a memorandum of Coleridge's recorded in *Anima Poetae* under date of 1806-7; Coleridge is listing many things he plans to do (and read), concluding: "Aristotle's Works, and to hunt for Proclus." Renewed interest in Neo-Platonism had made Coleridge resolve to get the original Greek of Proclus to supplement the Latin selections in the little volume of Marsilio Ficino that he had acquired in 1796.

It is Charles Lamb who gives us the first account of Coleridge as Neo-Platonist, and "inspired charity-boy" at Christ Hospital. Let us end this discussion with an extract from a letter of Lamb to Coleridge dated August 26, 1814:

I will not forget to look for *Proclus*. It is a kind of book which, when we meet with it, we shut up faster than we opened it. Yet I have some bastard kind of recollection that somewhere, some time ago, upon some stall or other, I saw it. It was either that or Plotinus, or Saint Augustine's *City of God*. So little do some folks value, what to others, *sc.* to you, "well used," had been the "Pledge of Immortality."

The last words are, I take it, a version of the final title of Wordsworth's *Intimations of Immortality* and so serve to join once more Proclus, Coleridge, and Wordsworth in the philosophy of the *Ode*; it was in the edition published the next March that Wordsworth first used the new title *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*.

JOHN D. REA

MIAMI UNIVERSITY



# MIDDLE-CLASS PHILOSOPHES, MIDDLE-CLASS PHILOSOPHY, IN THE DRAMA OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

OF ALL the eighteenth-century *dramas*, the most successful was Sedaine's *Le Philosophe sans le savoir*. One of the reasons for its success may be found in the harmony between the character and ideas of the principal personage Van Derk and the temperament and ideas of the contemporary bourgeoisie. Van Derk's platitudes represented the high point of bourgeois reasoning. Van Derk's code of ethics was none other than that of the middle classes. His views concerning honor, tolerance, prejudice, and reason coincided for the most part with their views.

Sedaine, however, is not unique in depicting the middle-class Philosophe with his middle-class philosophy. A group of playwrights, whose plays extended throughout the latter half of the eighteenth century, endeavored to portray the same type. An examination of their plays will disclose several striking resemblances to *Le Philosophe sans le savoir*. First, like Sedaine, the authors did not insist that the type of Philosophe they were portraying was closely identified with the exponents of the Encyclopedic movement. They did insist, however, that this character was the "real" Philosophe. Second, like Sedaine, they chose a character who possessed essentially the temperament, the ethics, and the point of view of a bourgeois. Finally, like Sedaine, they displayed admirably in their work the fusion of two eighteenth-century movements. The list compiled from the title-pages of these various plays is as follows:<sup>1</sup>

1. *La Veuve*, comédie en un acte et en prose, composée en l'année 1756. Le prix est de 24 sols. A Paris, chez Duchesne, Libraire, rue S. Jacques, au-dessous de la Fontaine S. Benoît, au Temple du Goût. M.DCC.LXIV [sic]. Avec approbation et privilège du Roi. [Author: Collé.]
2. *Le Bijoutier ou Le Philosophe en boutique*. 1756. Scènes épisodiques traduites d'une pièce anglaise de M. Gay fameux fabuliste. B.N., N. Ac. Fr. 2875. [A note to the manuscript states that the play is by Dodsley, not by Gay, and that it was translated by Patu in 1756.]

<sup>1</sup> The arrangement of the plays is chronological.

3. *Le Père de famille*, comédie en cinq actes et en prose, avec un discours sur la poésie dramatique. 1758. [Author: Diderot.]
4. Teisserenc, *La Femme philosophe*, comédie. [Presented at Liège in 1759. See *Journal encyclopédique* (May, 1760), p. 128. No copy of this play has been found.]
5. *Le Philosophe sans le savoir*, comédie en prose et en cinq actes, représentée par les Comédiens Français ordinaires du Roi, le 2 Novembre, 1765 [sic]. Par M. Sedaine. Le prix est de trente sols. A Paris, chez Claude Hérissant, Libraire-Imprimeur, rue Neuve Notre-Dame, à la Croix d'Or, M.DCCLXVI. Avec approbation et privilège du Roi.
6. *Conversation sur le Philosophe sans le savoir*. Comédie nouvelle, 1765. B.N., N. Ac. Fr. 2891 [Anonymous.]
7. *Le Vrai Philosophe* [sic], comédie en cinq actes et en prose, par M. Araignon, avocat au Parlement. Se vend à Paris chez Pankoucke, Libraire à côté de la Comédie Française. M.DCC.LXVII. B.N., Yf 7556.
8. *Ecole dramatique de l'homme*, suite des Jeux de la Petite Thalie, Age Viril, depuis vingt ans jusqu'à cinquante. Par M. de Moissy. A Amsterdam; et se trouve à Paris, chez Lacombe, rue Christine, près de la Rue Dauphine. Didot l'aîné, Libraire et Imprimeur, Rue Pavée, au coin du Quai des Augustins. MDCCLXX. [Contains *Le Paysan philosophe*, with the proverb: "A laver la tête d'un Maure, on perd sa lessive."]
9. *Les Deux Amis*, ou *Le Négociant de Lyon*, drame en cinq actes en prose; par M. de Beaumarchais. Représenté pour la première fois sur le Théâtre de la Comédie Française à Paris, le 13 Janvier 1770. A Paris, chez la Veuve Duchesne, rue St. Jacques, au Temple du Goût. MDCCLXX. Avec approbation et privilège du Roi.
10. *La Philosophe*, Anti-drame. "Le chagrin a toujours tort; celui qui rit est le vrai Sage." Le prix est de 24 sols. A Paris. Chez la Veuve Duchesne, Libraire, rue Saint-Jacques, au-dessous de la Fontaine Saint-Benoît, au Temple du Goût. M.DCC.LXXV. Avec approbation. [Author: Robillard de Beaunoir.]
11. *Le Sage dans sa retraite*, comédie en cinq actes et en prose mêlée d'ariettes, traduit de l'espagnol, par Mr. Linguet, mise au Théâtre Français par Mr. Dalainval, musique de Mr. Grétry, représentée pour la première fois au Théâtre Français à la Haye, pour le bénéfice de Mr. de Bray, le 19 Septembre, 1782. A la Haye chez H. Constapel, Libraire, M. DCC. LXXXII. [The author of the Spanish play is Don Juan de Matos Fragoso. The plot of this play is quite similar to that of *La Partie de chasse de Henri IV* of Collé and *Le Roi et le fermier* of Sedaine.]
12. *Théâtre des jeunes personnes*. Paris, 1785. Tome V. [Contains *Le Vrai Sage*, comédie en deux actes. The author is Mme de Genlis.]
13. *L'Ascendant de la vertu*, ou *La Paysanne philosophe*, comédie en 5 actes et en prose. A Paris, chez Prault, Imprimeur du Roi, Quai des Augustins, à L'Immortalité. 1787. [Author: Mme de Gléon. B.N., Yf 4521.]



14. *L'Artisan philosophe*, ou *L'Ecole des pères*, comédie, en un acte, en prose; par M. M. de P ... y. Représentée pour la première fois à Paris, sur le Théâtre de l'Ambigu-Comique, le lundi 17 Décembre 1787. "Qu'est-ce la fortune auprès de la probité?" *L'Art. Philos.* Pris 1 liv. 4 sols. A Paris, chez Cailleau, Imprimeur-Libraire, rue Galande, No. 64, 1788. [Quérard attributes this play to Pompigny.]
15. *Le Riche Laboureur* ou *Le Paysan philosophe*, pièce, 3, ornée de musique et de danse, imit. de l'Espagn; 1789, par P ... P ... y [Pompigny]. B.N., F. Fr. 9256.
16. *Le Marchand philosophe*, satire dramatique en un acte et en vers. B.N., Ms. Fr. 9258. [The manuscript is signed by Du Laurent. It was read and approved by Suard, Oct. 8, 1790.]
17. Durieu, *Le Vieillard philosophe*, pastorale héroïque en trois actes et en vers. An II. [This play has not been located. Mention is made of it in Soleinne.]
18. Bort, *Le Triomphe de la Philosophie*, drame en un acte et en vers. 179-. [Can be found at the Archives Nationales, F 17 1010.]
19. *La Bisarrerie de la fortune*, ou *Le Jeune Philosophe*, comédie en cinq actes, en prose, représentée pour la première fois au Théâtre du Marais, A Paris, le 16 Avril, 1793, reprise au Théâtre Français de la République, rue de la Loi. Par J. M. Loaisel Tréogate. Seconde édition, revue et corrigée par l'Auteur, avec un nouveau dénouement. A Troyes, au Magasin général des Pièces de Théâtre; chez Gobelet, Imprimeur-Libraire, près la Maison Commune, No. 206. Et à Paris, chez Barba, Libraire, Maison du Petit-Dunkerque, Quai Conti, vis-à-vis le Pont Neuf. An VII. [The play is a translation of Mowinski, *Les Coups du sort*. See Brazier, *Les Petits Théâtres de Paris*, II, 12.]

The relationship which existed between the plays and the Encyclopedic movement is difficult to establish on account of the different attitudes of the authors toward the Philosophic party. Sedaine, for instance, was in sympathy with the Encyclopedists. The authors of *Le Père de famille* and *Les Deux Amis*, Diderot and Beaumarchais, were known to be Philosophes themselves. Mme de Genlis, on the other hand, professed to be an opponent of the party. Three foreign authors, whose works were copied in five<sup>1</sup> of the plays—the Pole Mowinski, the Englishman Dodsley, and the Portuguese Matos Fragoso—could not possibly have had any connection with the Philosophic movement, nor could they have had it in view when they

<sup>1</sup> *Le Bijoutier* and *Le Marchand philosophe* were taken from Dodsley's *The Toy-Shop*; *Le Sage dans sa retraite* and *Le Paysan philosophe* were taken from Fragoso's *El Sabio en su retiro y villano en su rincón*; *La Bisarrerie de la fortune* was taken from Mowinski's *Les Coups du sort*.

composed their works. Still others, such as Collé, for instance, are known to be frankly indifferent to it. Consequently, according to the varying attitudes toward the Encyclopedists, the purpose of each author in writing his play varies. Sedaine avowedly wrote *Le Philosophe sans le savoir* in order to defend those who had been maligned by Palissot's *Les Philosophes*. Voltaire saw in *Le Père de famille* the best reply to the attacks of Palissot. And, in contrast to Diderot and Sedaine, Aragón, who was indifferent to the Philosophes, professed to write his play solely to depict a small portion of the sublime virtues of the people of St. Malo.<sup>1</sup>

Irrespective, however, of the attitudes of the authors and the purposes they had in writing the plays, it is certain that they exhibited some hesitation in identifying as Philosophes the characters they portrayed. This hesitation is apparent in the way the term "Philosophe" was used in the titles. Sometimes it is omitted from the title, but placed in the subtitle,<sup>2</sup> which seems to indicate that the principal character, though primarily not a Philosophe, might be regarded as one. At other times, the term is used in the title and suppressed later, as in Collé's *La Veuve philosophe*, which he published as *La Veuve*,<sup>3</sup> although Grimm persisted in calling it *La Veuve philosophe*.<sup>4</sup> Evidently, Collé saw something of a Philosophe in the principal character, yet he seemed to feel hesitation in identifying her with a contemporary Encyclopedist. Grimm, however, felt no such hesitation. At another time, the term "Philosophe" does not occur in the original title of a foreign work, but is introduced into the translations, first appearing in the subtitle and then in the title. This phenomenon occurs in Dodsley's *The Toy-Shop*<sup>5</sup> and in the two translations of Dodsley's play entitled, respectively, *Le Bijoutier ou Le Philosophe en boutique* and *Le Marchand philosophe*. In Dodsley's play, a merchant is presented as satirist and moralist and nothing is said about him as a Philosophe, nor is he presented as having a philosophy. The few lines at the end of the play sum up his character as presented by Dodsley:

<sup>1</sup> *Le Vrai Philosophe*, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Le Bijoutier ou Le Philosophe en boutique*, *Le Riche Laboureur ou Le Paysan philosophe*, *L'Ascendant de la vertu ou La Paysanne philosophe*, *La Bisarrerie de la fortune ou Le Jeune Philosophe*.

<sup>3</sup> Collé, *Correspondance et Mémoires*, II, 337.

<sup>4</sup> Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire* (Feb., 1764).

<sup>5</sup> See *Trifles* (2d ed., R. Dodsley; printed for J. Dodsley in Pall-Mall, 1777).

In this gay thoughtless age he's found a way,  
 In trifling things just morals to convey;  
 'Tis his at once to please, and to reform,  
 And give old satire a new power to charm.  
 And, would you guide your lives and actions right,  
 Think on the maxims you have heard tonight.<sup>1</sup>

Patu, making a translation of *The Toy-Shop* in 1756, gave it the title *Le Bijoutier ou Le Philosophe en boutique*, while in 1790, Du Laurent, making a second translation of the work, called it *Le Marchand philosophe*. Thus, when the play was first written in 1732, the author made no effort to connect the character with the Philosophic movement. In 1756, on the other hand, Patu saw enough of a *Philosophe* in the characterization of the merchant to warrant the subtitle *Le Philosophe en boutique*, and, in 1790, Du Laurent felt justified in speaking of him in the title as a *Philosophe*. Finally, a play appears in which enough similarity occurs between the principal character and a *Philosophe* to warrant the use of "sage" in the title. As time goes on, however, the general term "sage" will be changed into the more specific term "*Philosophe*." This occurs in Fragoso's *El Sabio en su retiro*,<sup>2</sup> which was translated into French by Linguet in 1782 with the title *Le Sage dans sa retraite* and by Pompigny in 1789 with the title *Le Riche Laboureur ou Le Paysan philosophe*.

What relationship, then, existed between the plays and the Philosophic movement and between the *Philosophes* of the plays and such contemporary personages as Helvétius, Voltaire, and Diderot? At best, the plays bear witness to the existence of a Philosophic party, but they are not intimately connected with it. Nor were they written to criticize or condemn it. They unite in showing what an ideal *Philosophe* should be rather than in attacking or defending what a contemporary *Philosophe* was supposed to be. In this respect, they were undoubtedly influenced by the movement; it is doubtful whether they, in turn, had any considerable influence upon it. Also, since the term "*Philosophe*" can be used or discarded with such ease in referring to the principal personages of these plays, it seems fair to assume that the characters presented are not intimately connected with individual *Philosophes*. Not that they do not bear resemblances to certain members of the Philosophic group, but those resemblances, in the opinion

<sup>1</sup> P. 34.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal encyclopédique* (Dec., 1770), p. 427.

of the playwrights, did not justify a complete identification between their character and any individual *Philosophe*. Hence the plays served rather to reflect the vogue of a *Philosophic* party, its expansion among the masses and the consequent modification of its doctrines, than to give any adequate picture of its ideals, defects, and struggles. And the *Philosophes* whom they portrayed represent rather the persons influenced by the presence of the *Encyclopedists* than the *Encyclopedists* themselves.

Although the *Philosophes* in the plays are but loosely connected with the *Encyclopedic* movement, there is a tendency on the part of the authors to insist that they are the "real" *Philosophes*. In Patu's play, *Caustique* explains his manner of philosophizing to his customers, and one of them exclaims: "Monsieur, bien des gens se donnent aujourd'hui pour philosophes, mais le vrai est dans votre boutique."<sup>1</sup> The Marquis d'Orsimont, in *Le Vrai Philosophe*, rejoices that virtuous people find favor in the eyes of heaven, since heaven recompenses so liberally the simple desire to be virtuous. The count replies to his son's remark: "Mon fils, c'est parler en vrai philosophe."<sup>2</sup> After the publication of *Le Sage dans sa retraite*, the *Journal encyclopédique*<sup>3</sup> devoted to it an article. "Jean le laboureur," ran a passage of the article, "le principal personnage de cette comédie, est un paysan vraiment philosophe qui regarde comme le plus grand des bienfaits de l'Etre suprême de l'avoir préservé de l'ambition." Ophémon tells his son in *Mme de Genlis'* play: "Le vrai sage est ami de l'ordre, observateur exact des bienséances, et jamais il ne paraîtra mépriser les droits de la naissance et du rang."<sup>4</sup> In *Pompigny's Le Riche Laboureur*, the king explains to one of his courtiers that he has met a real *Philosophe*: "J'ai vu ce matin un homme, oui, un homme qui m'a inspiré le goût de la retraite. C'est un bon esprit, un vrai philosophe sans s'en douter."<sup>5</sup> The insistence that this type is the "real" *Philosophe* is significant, since one is led to infer that many people are posing as such who are not at all worthy of the name. The unworthy *Philosophes* are the *valets*, the *apprentis*, the *soi-disant*, the *à la mode*—in short, all the varieties of contemporary *Philosophes*.<sup>6</sup> Each variety, these playwrights lead one to believe, may possess some

<sup>1</sup> *Le Bijoutier*, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> *Le Vrai Philosophe*, Act V, scene xvi.

<sup>4</sup> *Théâtre des jeunes personnes*, V, 290.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* (Dec., 1770), p. 427.

<sup>5</sup> *Le Riche Laboureur*, p. 159.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. I. Wade, *The Philosophe in the French Drama of the Eighteenth Century*, p. 54.

characteristics of a *Philosophe*, but no variety wholly represents the "real" *Philosophe*. And so the playwrights endeavored to present the composite picture of an ideal *Philosophe*—the type who would be wholly acceptable to every individual man and who could upon occasion represent every individual *Philosophe*.

What, then, are the characteristics of the "real" *Philosophes*? Two of them are women. Mme Durval, in *La Veuve*, is thus portrayed:

Veuve, belle, n'ayant tout au plus que vingt-six à vingt-sept ans, prodigieusement riche, c'est elle-même qui conduit toutes ses affaires. Elle se passe d'intendant, et cela ne paraît pas l'occuper; il lui reste encore un temps considérable à donner à toutes les connaissances de pur agrément; et même à des connaissances assez abstraites; car l'on n'est pas plus instruite qu'elle l'est, l'on n'a pas plus d'esprit qu'elle en a.<sup>1</sup>

Mme Durval, a cultured lady, devoted to the acquisition of knowledge, is the typical eighteenth-century *femme philosophe*. She has many traits in common with a Mme Geoffrin. She does not, however, maintain a salon, nor does she mingle with the Voltaires, the Helvétiuses, and the D'Alemberts. Mme de Saint Hilaire, in *La Philosophe*,<sup>2</sup> resembles her rather closely. She is about the age of Mme Durval. She, too, has a *figure très revenante*; she, too, is a widow who possesses a fortune. She differs from Mme Durval only in temperament. Instead of the fondness for abstract knowledge which characterized the latter, she has a "caractère charmant, son humeur [est] si gaie, si vraie, que le chagrin le plus noir ne peut tenir contre sa folie."

Three of the "real" *Philosophes* seem to be chiefly concerned with conduct. Caustique, in *Le Bijoutier*,<sup>3</sup> differs considerably from Mme Durval. In the first place, he is not interested in abstract knowledge; he has none the less a native common sense which is the basis of his "philosophy." Primarily, he is a moralist. "Il critique tout, mais sans rudesse et sans méchanceté. Sa coutume est de moraliser sur chacune des bagatelles qu'il vend. Il amènera une instruction à propos d'un dés, d'une tabatière." Caustique is the type of the eternal bourgeois, industrious, matter of fact, practical. Jullien, in Moissy's *Le Paysan philosophe*, resembles the Caustique of *Le Marchand philosophe*. Mme Dériville thus describes him to a relative:

<sup>1</sup> P. 4.

<sup>2</sup> P. 14.

<sup>3</sup> P. 16.

C'est un frondeur de tous nos usages, un gros critique des mœurs de la ville, qui croit qu'il n'y a plus d'honnêtes gens que dans les villages et les chaumières; encore pense-t-il que leurs habitants apprennent à cesser d'avoir une probité exacte, quand ils viennent à la ville commercer leurs denrées. ... Mettez par-dessus tout cela un gros vernis d'érudition villageoise ou gothique, qu'il empâte d'une morale assommante. ... Cet homme n'est point du tout timide, sa grosse franchise va toujours son train; il a ce ton d'indépendance et de liberté que donne une façon de vivre aisée, mais rustique.<sup>1</sup>

As a matter of fact, Jullien, "frondeur de tous les usages," "gros critique des mœurs de la ville," independent and free, reminds one very much of a non-literary Rousseau. When the same type was portrayed as Jean in Linguet's *Le Sage dans sa retraite*, the *Journal encyclopédique*<sup>2</sup> called him a *Philosophe* without the *morgue* or the *sévérité* of the eighteenth-century variety.

Finally, at least one of the "real" *Philosophes* is essentially a philanthropist. The Marquis d'Orsimont, of *Le Vrai Philosophe*,<sup>3</sup> is more of an idealist than Caustique, Jullien, and Jean, but, strangely enough, he practices in his idealism those virtues which the middle-class Caustique, without rank, would practice naturally: honesty, loyalty, regard for social contracts, and, above all, beneficence and firmness in adversity. These last two characteristics especially are those which assure to the marquis the title "*Philosophe*." "*L'adversité ne saurait seulement l'émouvoir. ... Il ne s'occupe qu'à faire des heureux. ...*" These traits are present in more or less degree in the contemporary eighteenth-century *Philosophe*. One has only to recall Voltaire's work in the village of Ferney, or Helvétius at Voré, or even Diderot's definition of *vertu* as *la bienfaisance*. And firmness in adversity is the common trait of all philosophers.

Thus the dominant element in Mme Durval's philosophy is culture; in Mme de Saint Hilaire's, optimism; in D'Orsimont's, philanthropy. Caustique, Jullien, and Jean are essentially moralists, interested in rules of conduct. None of them, however, has a system of philosophy. At best, these "real" *Philosophes* are but amateurs, concerning themselves with the more popular phases of philosophy, and differing considerably from one another in mental training and interests.

<sup>1</sup> Moissy, *Le Paysan philosophe*, pp. 151, 159.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* (Aug., 1770), p. 422.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 9-10.



Not only do they differ from one another in interests and aptitudes, they differ also in social standing. In *Le Vrai Philosophe* and *La Philosophe*, the character presented as a Philosophe is a noble. Van Derk, in *Le Philosophe sans le savoir*, though a man of noble birth, has renounced his nobility and become a bourgeois merchant. Thus he occupies a unique position as representative of both classes. In several of the plays, the Philosophe is a wealthy, respected member of the upper bourgeoisie. The father in *Le père de famille* belongs to this group. Mme Durval, in Collé's *La Veuve*, is the widow of a wealthy shipbuilder; Mélaç, in *Les Deux Amis*, a *receveur-général des fermes*, a type of federal-reserve banker; and his friend Aurelly, a wealthy merchant of Lyons. Ophémon, in *Le Vrai Sage*, is a retired merchant. The lesser bourgeois is represented in *Le Bijoutier* and in *Le Marchand philosophe*. In both plays, the Philosophe, M. Caustique, is a shopkeeper operating a fairly successful jewelry shop. He is in comfortable circumstances, but by no means wealthy. The *Jeune Philosophe* furnishes the transition between the lesser bourgeoisie and the lower orders. Georges, the Philosophe of the play, is a vagabond student, whereas his uncle is an innkeeper. Du Taillis, another Philosophe in the play, is a forest guard. Prud'homme in Pompiigny's *L'Artisan philosophe* is a locksmith. In another play of Pompiigny, Felicio is a peasant Philosophe. Likewise, in *Le Sage dans sa retraite*, Jean is a rich peasant, and in *La Paysanne philosophe*, Monique, who aspires to become a Philosophe, a peasant woman. Thus, socially, the characters range from the highest to the lowest, though the majority of them are members of the upper or lower bourgeoisie. Like the contemporary bourgeois, they mingle with those of higher rank. Mme Durval receives a visit from the Marquise de Leutry who proposes to marry her to the Count de Leutry. She finally marries the Chevalier du Lauret. The relationships of Van Derk and his aristocratic sister have been discussed elsewhere. Jean, the laborer, becomes the counselor of a king, and his daughter is made a duchess. Monique, the peasant woman, openly opposes the wishes of the Count de Résilly, son of her former mistress. Like the contemporary bourgeois, also, they have gained by means of their wealth the reputation and the respect which had previously been the heritage of the nobility. Finally, like the bourgeois, they are welded together by a class



philosophy which, in reality, is none other than the philosophy of the middle classes.

This class philosophy, like the philosophy of Van Derk, consists largely of certain platitudinous moralizations. Let us consider examples from the various plays. Mme Durval, in *La Veuve*, remarks that by nature man wearies quickly of an emotion. When Mme de Leutry proposes to her to marry the count, she replies that love can exist only between two free and equal persons. M. Caustique, who has gone into the jewelry business, opines that the world is only a great jeweler's shop where mankind is crazy over trinkets. All of us have our weaknesses, says Caustique. The Marquis d'Orsimont, disinherited, poor, abandoned, maintains that one is always happy in spite of bad luck when virtue has not ceased to spread its respectable empire over our souls. Elsewhere, he states that one must be ready for anything in this life. Mélaç, in Beaumarchais' *Les Deux Amis*, holds that the first punishment for the one who ceases being decent is to lose soon all desire to be decent. After he has sacrificed his reputation for his friend, he exclaims: "To demand gratitude is to sell one's services." He maintains that appearances can only disturb him who has judged himself guilty. Mme de Saint Hilaire teaches Morose that our happiness resides in our way of thinking. Monique, in *La Paysanne philosophe*, is bubbling over with platitudes. "Wisdom," she says, "is a plant which grows up from a seed." The world, she thinks, has always been the same, and no one will ever change it. Prud'homme, in *L'Artisan philosophe*, finds that it is useless to complain. Felicio remarks that joy must not be used as a cloak for idleness. Georges, in *La Bisarrerie de la fortune*, calls study the consoling charm of existence, and life a journey during which man is now well sheltered, now badly sheltered. This method, which consists in reducing the problems of life to apothegms, has always been regarded with much favor by the bourgeoisie. It is not surprising, therefore, that it became characteristic of the "bourgeois" Philosophe.

In addition to their platitudinous moralizations, the "bourgeois" Philosophes have a definite code of ethics, in which honesty plays an important rôle. The Comte d'Orsimont proposes a dishonest action to his son, who refuses to consider it. The valet of the marquis affirms that "l'opulence ne peut le tenter." Caustique complains that honesty

has become a trifle.<sup>1</sup> Sedaine's chief character, it will be remembered, was scrupulously honest in his business negotiations with the elder Desparville. Jullien bewails the fact that honest people are all in the village and country cottages, and even there they are becoming tainted with the dishonesty of the cities.<sup>2</sup> Aurelly, Mélac, Prud'homme, and Jean all insist upon the most scrupulous honesty. Much insistence is also placed upon virtue. Virtue, however, is now a personal rule of conduct, not Montesquieu's political principle. The Marquis d'Orsimont<sup>3</sup> affirms that "nulle puissance sur la terre ne saura me faire manquer à ce que je dois à la vertu." Mélac<sup>4</sup> exclaims: "Entre une action criminelle et un acte de vertu, l'on n'est pas incertain." Jean, *le laboureur*,<sup>5</sup> informs his daughter Beatrice that he has chosen for her husband a laborer, well built, moderate, and virtuous. "C'est cette dernière qualité surtout," he adds, "dont je fais le plus de cas." Sophie<sup>6</sup> says her father Prud'homme is poor, but he is virtuous. Philanthropy is no less important for these Philosophes than honesty and virtue. The Marquis d'Orsimont, according to Merlin,<sup>7</sup> his valet, "ne s'occupe qu'à faire des heureux; quoiqu'il ne jouisse que d'une fortune médiocre, vu son illustre naissance et son état de colonel: l'industrie de son cœur généreux lui fait trouver des ressources dans sa noble économie, qui le mettent à même de répandre ses bienfaits sur les infortunés." Van Derk brings up Victorine as if she were his own child. Aurelly practices the same generosity toward the Mélac family. Jean gives a portion of his wealth to the poor. He has fields which he plants expressly for them.<sup>8</sup> Ophémon, having constructed a *château*, retires to the country, where he amuses himself distributing alms to the poor. Monique protects her god-child Pauline and marries her to Alexis. Georges,<sup>9</sup> having inherited a fortune, considers that it is of no value in itself; but, thinking of the good use to which it may be put, he deems one should not reject its advantages. Simplicity of living is likewise characteristic of this group. Jean dresses in gray serge, and his dishes are of coarse clay. He loves simplicity in everything; he hates useless expenditure. But, withal, he is not miserly.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Toy-Shop*, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Moissy, *Le Paysan philosophe*, p. 159.

<sup>3</sup> *Le Vrai Philosophe*, p. 20.

<sup>4</sup> *Les Deux Amis*, p. 41.

<sup>5</sup> *Le Sage dans sa retraite*, p. 54.

<sup>6</sup> *L'Artisan philosophe*, p. 5.

<sup>7</sup> *Le Vrai Philosophe*, pp. 9, 10.

<sup>8</sup> *Le Sage dans sa retraite*, p. 21.

<sup>9</sup> *La Bisarrerie de la fortune*, p. 71.

<sup>10</sup> *Le Sage dans sa retraite*, p. 21.

The code of ethics of the whole group may be summed up in the advice given by Jean<sup>1</sup> to his son who is about to leave for court:

Tu vas à la cour, mon enfant, tu es jeune et riche, tu auras grand besoin d'aller la sonde à la main, sur une mer si pleine d'écueils; d'abord, conserve ta vertu, voilà le moyen de te sauver de tous les dangers, ensuite mesure ta dépense sur ton bien, ne fais point de dettes et paie toujours au moment où tu as promis. Ne sois ni avare, ni prodigue, l'un te déshonore, l'autre te ruine, mais songe, cependant, ce qu'on dépense, on le perd, ce qu'on épargne, on le retrouve, fais en sorte de paraître toujours complaisant et jamais bas, sois poli; la politesse fait aimer. Cela coûte peu et rien n'est plus avantageux. Sans être de l'avis de tout le monde, ne contredis jamais personne: on se fait par là des ennemis sans convaincre ceux à qui l'on parle. Pour ce qui regarde les femmes, je n'ai rien à te dire, tu es marié avec Constance et je ne te crois pas capable de lui manquer; mais cependant conduis-toi avec les autres femmes de façon que ta retenue ne soit point grossièreté, ni tes honnêtetés galanterie. ...

The "bourgeois" Philosophes are likewise characterized by certain opinions analogous to those held by members of the Philosophic party. The views of Van Derk concerning honor, prejudice, reason, and tolerance have already been discussed.<sup>2</sup> Like Van Derk, the Marquis d'Orsimont is much concerned with honor. Merlin<sup>3</sup> states that his master "n'a que l'honneur pour guide." Monique<sup>4</sup> recalls to the mind of the chevalier his honor: "Souffrez que je vous rappelle celle que vous avez perdue. Elle sera plus que moi dans ce moment où la justice et l'honneur semblent avoir quitté votre cœur." Caustique<sup>5</sup> complains that honor has become an idle bauble. While these characters are strangely silent about *les préjugés* and tolerance, their silence is important in showing the moderation of their philosophy. They still have considerable regard, however, for reason. Georges<sup>6</sup> introduces himself as "un homme qui voudrait que la raison, portant son flambeau d'un bout de la terre à l'autre, ne fût bientôt de tout le genre humain qu'une seule et grande famille." Reason, however, for them has become common sense, and theory has been abandoned in favor of the practical. As Jullien says in *Le Paysan philosophe*:<sup>7</sup> "J'ai suivi, j'ai étudié simplement la nature; et trente ans d'expérience valent mieux, à mon gré, que tous les traités de tant de gens qui se

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 56-57.    <sup>2</sup> See *PMLA*, December, 1928.    <sup>3</sup> *Le Vrai Philosophe*, p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> *La Paysanne philosophe*, p. 39.

<sup>5</sup> *La Bisarrerie de la fortune*, p. 28.

<sup>6</sup> *The Toy-Shop*, p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> P. 174.

mêlent de raisonner et d'écrire sans pratiquer, d'après une sèche théorie qui ne produit rien qui vaille."<sup>1</sup> It is also interesting to note that these Philosophes are entertaining one idea of a social nature. Mme Durval, in *La Veuve*, is opposed to marriage, save between two persons free and equal, since the only method of preserving equality is to associate and to ally one's self with people of equal rank. When a noble is proposed as a prospective husband for Beatrice, Jean<sup>2</sup> exclaims: "Non, de ma vie; pour que ce que j'ai amassé par mes travaux, on le dissipe à des niaiseries, non, non, il faut de la convenance dans les mariages. Je suis riche, mais je n'oublie pour cela ni mon nom, ni mon état. ..." Ophémon<sup>3</sup> is more specific about this point than Jean. When he learns that his son is planning to marry the peasant girl Colette, he advises against the plan, because of the girl's lack of education. "Et voilà," continues Ophémon, "l'inégalité la plus remarquable et la plus réelle qui puisse exister entre les hommes. Nous devons respecter les distinctions établies dans la société." Monique opposes the marriage of Pauline and the Chevalier de Résilly upon similar grounds. Marriage between persons of equal rank seems to be one of the principles of this type of Philosophe.<sup>4</sup> Not only are all these opinions analogous to those held by certain of the Philosophic party, they are also quite similar to the views commonly held by the bourgeoisie. Honor, tolerance, common sense, the practical, such characteristics as these are usually identified with the eighteenth-century middle class.

There are several points of resemblance between the Philosophes presented in these plays and the contemporary type. For instance, the plays portray a Philosophe of the bourgeoisie and of the lesser orders—a portrayal which harmonizes with the usual assumption that a contemporary Philosophe was either a member of the upper or lesser bourgeoisie as were Voltaire, Diderot, Helvétius, or distinctly *peuple* as was Rousseau. Then, too, the beneficence of Ophémon, Mélac, or M. Van Derk call to mind the beneficences of Voltaire and Helvétius. The common-sense, practical nature of Jean, Caustique, or Aurelly reminds one of the practical common sense of a Voltaire and the insistence of the whole Encyclopedic party upon *bon sens*. The emphasis

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Voltaire's letter to Mme du Deffand (June 18, 1770).

<sup>2</sup> *Le Sage dans sa retraite*, p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Théâtre des jeunes personnes*, V, 290.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Rousseau, *Œuvres* (ed. Hachette), II, 378-79.

placed in these plays upon the accumulation of wealth, the improvement of agriculture, and the development of commerce accords with the stand either of the Physiocrats or the Encyclopedists. Lastly, the virtue and morality preached and practiced by Van Derk, Mélac, Verceil, Jean, and others, are quite in harmony with the moral reform of Rousseau.

There are, nevertheless, striking dissimilarities between these Philosophes and such Philosophes as Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, Helvétius. The former group is totally unorganized. Such characters neither form a "bourgeois" Philosophe party, nor do they wish membership in the contemporary Encyclopedic party. They are Philosophes *sans le savoir* as Sedaine represented Van Derk, or they are Philosophes *sans s'en douter* as Pompigny characterized Jean in *Le Riche Laboureur*. Moreover, they disregard the theories which were cherished by the eighteenth-century contemporary Philosophe. In these plays, there is not the slightest allusion either to the theory of personal interest, or to the doctrine of the sensations, or to the theory of the decline of civilization, or to the doctrine of inequality. There are none of those subversive political, ethical, and religious ideas which have been commonly attributed to the Encyclopedic party, and the skeptical, critical spirit is not manifest. At best, this middle-class Philosophe has certain views similar to some of those of the Philosophic party, but he is not a "propagandist," not a "radical," not "dangerous." He is a "bourgeois" by nature, and only a Philosophe by accident.

These plays, then, portray an interesting moment in the history of the Philosophic party. Their appearance was contemporary with the entrance of the bourgeoisie into the ranks of the Philosophes, a movement which was one of the results of the struggles between the Philosophes and their opponents. The struggle was marked both by a rapid expansion of philosophic doctrine among the bourgeoisie and the rise of the bourgeoisie to an important position in the organization of society. Expansion of philosophic doctrine and rise of the bourgeoisie were progressing simultaneously; it was inevitable that they should influence each other. Although some ideas of the Philosophes were rejected by the bourgeoisie, others found favor with the middle classes. And although some principles of the bourgeoisie were incom-

patible with those of the Philosophes, the latter saw an advantage in recruiting new members from the ranks of the former. A junction was effected between the two parties—the bourgeois lending the support of their numbers to the Philosophe in return for a philosophy, but reserving the right to reject or modify the philosophic doctrine wherever it was deemed to run counter to the common sense and conservatism characteristic of the middle classes.

In sum, these plays have a threefold import: First, they confirm the characterization of Van Derk in Sedaine's *Le Philosophe sans le savoir*. That Van Derk is a Philosophe has often been questioned. But with a dozen other playwrights portraying as a Philosophe a character similar to Van Derk, there can no longer be any doubt that such a type existed in the eighteenth century. Second, taking their origin in the Bourgeois movement as well as in the Philosophic movement, they present the relationship of the two groups. They show the wide appeal made by the Philosophes to all classes and conditions, as well as the interest shown by the middle classes in the Philosophic movement. Lastly, they are important because of the portrayal they give of the "bourgeois" Philosophe as a type. There must have been many individuals in actual life who possessed the characteristics of this Philosophe or the type would not have appeared so many times upon the stage. Although this new Philosophe seems only loosely connected with the Encyclopedic movement, yet he shows resemblances as well as dissimilarities to such avowed Philosophes as Helvétius, Voltaire, and Diderot. Although he is portrayed as belonging to every class, he partakes chiefly of the middle-class point of view. His philosophy, to be sure, is by no means a complete one, and his philosophical interests are decidedly partial. Broadly speaking, he possesses a fund of platitudinous remarks held in common with the bourgeois, a code of ethics held in common with both the bourgeois and the Encyclopedist, and certain views not very numerous held in common with the Encyclopedists. Still he is characterized with some insistence as the "real" Philosophe, to distinguish him from the more "advanced" types. In reality, however, he is only a middle-class Philosophe with a middle-class philosophy.

IRA O. WADE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY





## REVIEWS

*Le Roman de Tristan et Iseut dans l'Œuvre de Thomas Malory.* By

EUGÈNE VINAVER. Paris: Champion, 1925. Pp. 244.

It has long been known that Malory's version of the Tristan story was based upon the Old French prose *Tristan*—the essential facts of the relationship were noted by Sommer and Löseth as early as 1890—but no one has made a thoroughgoing study of the English version with reference to its place in the development of the French Tristan tradition. This now Mr. Vinaver has set himself to do. Beginning very wisely with a careful comparison of the English text with the French manuscripts, he is able to offer concrete and detailed evidence of the dependence of Malory's account on specific versions of the French prose romance, namely, the versions represented by MSS B.N. 103, 334, and 99. On the basis of this evidence he then endeavors to establish the hypothesis—proposed, it should not be forgotten, by Sommer—of a single French source, and, in the second part of his book, makes important observations upon the originality of Sir Thomas.

The evidence offered of Malory's kinship with MSS 103, 334, and 99 is convincing. E. Löseth (*Analyse*, pp. xxii f.) had already pointed out the important instances in which Malory follows MSS 103 and 99; Mr. Vinaver furnishes the proof, and, in addition, is able to make the discovery that Malory's version is also related to MS 334. There are, however, objections to the author's theory of the composition of the French source of *Morte Darthur*. He attempts to prove that this source was a compilation made from MSS 103, 334, and 99, used consecutively and in the order named. He believes that he can delimit exactly the influence of each of these versions: MSS 103 accounts for approximately Books VIII–IX, chapter xxiii (Sommer's reprint, pp. 273, 1–373, 4), which he calls Section A; MS 334 accounts for Book IX, chapter xxviii—Book X, chapter xxvi (Sommer, pp. 383, 18–455, 17), Section B; and MS 99 for Book X, chapter xxviii—Book XII (Sommer, pp. 459, 8–611, 34), Section C. And finally he maintains that within the sections the author, with minor exceptions, never alternates sources; the influence of one version ends where that of the next begins. But the exceptions cannot be regarded as unimportant. Of the four traits discussed as common to Malory and MS 103 alone, two, the description of the death of Lamorak and the allusion to the departure of Lancelot from Joyeuse Garde, are, as Mr. Vinaver himself notes, in Section C of Malory, not in Section A as we should expect. Moreover, in the magic-horn incident, Book VIII, chapter xxxiv, that is, in Section A, Malory agrees with the other versions against MS 103. To these instances we should add Malory's reading *Sup-*

*pynabyles* for the knight in Brittany, Book VIII, chapter xxxvi, agreeing with the *Sup(p)inable* of the common version, while MS 103 has *Pinabel* (as have also 750 and 12599; cf. Löseth, § 59). Mr. Vinaver does not mention this disagreement between Malory and MS 103 in his discussion, but in an Appendix of Proper Names (p. 232) offers the explanation that Caxton must have misprinted *Syppynabylis* for *Syr Pynabylis*. He apparently overlooked the *Sup(p)inable* of the common version. Thus we find the influence of MS 103 reaching beyond Section A, and in that section Malory in agreement with other versions.

Mr. Vinaver's most suggestive discovery is the source of Malory's puzzling first *explicit* in MS 334. This indicates, of course, the use of the 334 version in at least this portion of the English romance. Additional proof is furnished by isolated agreement of the two in the account of the battle between Palamides and the unknown knight (Book IX, chap. xxviii), and in the reading of certain proper names (see p. 56). Significant also perhaps is the observation that MS 334 alone gives the English form *Tristram* of the hero's name. But the influence of MS 334 ceases, according to our author, before Book X, chapter xxviii, where he cites Malory's reading *Arguys* as evidence that the redactor has begun to use MS 99, which reads *Argus*, while 334 has *Ardons* (for *Argons*). But here again we must object. For if we turn to Löseth (§ 272) we find that this *Argus* of MS 99 is of the *line of Ban*; according to Malory, *Sir Arguys* is of the *blood of Kyng Mark*, and in this he agrees with MS 334 and the other versions. Again, most of the versions of this incident, 99 apparently included, as Löseth makes no exception of it, state that King Mark's army was divided into four parts, which are enumerated. Malory agrees with MS 334 in naming only three (cf. Löseth, § 272). Mr. Vinaver's delimitation of the influence of MSS 334 and 99 is obviously based upon very unsubstantial evidence. It would seem more probable that in this incident Malory is still following the 334 version. Whether he continued to do so we cannot tell; MS 334 unfortunately ends with this episode (Löseth, § 279). With reference to the relation of Malory to MS 334 in other parts of his story it is worth noting, however, that Mr. Vinaver states in his *Etudes sur le Tristan en Prose* (p. 33): "Le ms. 334 ne rentre dans aucun autre groupe; il paraît plus ancien que les mss. B.N. fr. 97, 99, etc., si bien que, dans la deuxième partie du roman, il en forme la base commune." And Löseth remarks (p. xx), referring to the first part of the romance, that MSS 104 and 103 are "fréquemment d'accord et suivent ordinairement, surtout 103, le texte de 334." (Italics in both quotations are mine.) Further investigation of the relation of Malory to MS 334 might not be unprofitable.

The final episodes of the *Tristram*, beginning with that of Alysaunder le orphelyn, present essentially the same version as MS 99. But as Malory constantly offers details missing in MS 99, the latter cannot be regarded as his immediate source; both perhaps derive from a common original. MSS 99 and 316 (Chantilly) alone explain the second *explicit*.

We can refer only briefly to Mr. Vinaver's excellent study of the personal element in Malory's work. The guiding influence in Malory's condensing, and he has condensed his source to one-sixth its original volume, seems to have been a desire to reduce the importance of the purely adventurous element in his story, the *matière*. He strove, although with all too little success, to subordinate his material to a central idea. Thus he at least tended to emphasize the *sens* of the romance, an element that had almost disappeared in the French prose. It is interesting to find Malory, who knew only the corrupted prose versions, returning in his way to the standpoint of the great verse romances of the twelfth century. Malory's originality appears finally, Mr. Vinaver points out, in his attempt to restore the chivalric ideal to its former purity and vigor.

L. E. WINFREY

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

*Balor with the Evil Eye. Studies in Celtic and French Literature.* By ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927. Pp. 229.

The thirteen essays in this volume range from pre-Christian Ireland to Ronsard's *Hymne de la Mort*. A greater unity would have been obtained had the author limited himself to Celtic tradition and to folklore. I find myself unable to comment on the essays on "Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube, *Aymeri de Narbonne* and Marquis Boniface II of Montferrat," and "The Classical Sources of Pierre de Ronsard's *Hymne de la Mort*." A detailed examination of the essays would necessarily be lengthy. Since Professor Krappe refers on several occasions to matters of method and principle, I venture to limit the present notice to such general considerations.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Krappe speaks (pp. 4-5) of a possible "inheritance from Indo-European times, or, more correctly, from a time when Celts and Slavs were closer neighbors than they are now." In this connection he might have cited von Sydow's ingenious article, "Folksagan såsom indoeuropeisk tradition,"<sup>2</sup> which argues for the existence of such Indo-European tales. To this subject I hope to return at another time, but I cannot refrain from pointing out that the existence of a giant with an evil eye in both Serbian and Celtic tradition cannot without further discussion serve as evidence of an Indo-European inheritance or prehistoric connection. A linguistic student demands cogent proof before accepting a Polish *pięć* as cognate with an Irish *coic*. Another troublesome but interesting point is the assertion (p. 16) regarding a particular version of a story in which "one suspects that the accumulation of inci-

<sup>1</sup> It is needless and ungracious to add new examples to the many stories cited. Professor Krappe, for example, could not have had knowledge of Jan de Vries's excellent study, "De sage van het ingemetselde kind," *Nederlandsch Tijdschrift voor Volkskunde*, XXXII (1927), 1-13, which treats the same subject as his essay (pp. 165-80), "The Foundation Sacrifice and the Child's Last Words."

<sup>2</sup> *Arkiv for nordisk filologi*, XLII (1925), 1-19; see also the abstract in *Niederdeutsche Zs. f. Volkskunde*, 1925.

dents is the result of a fusion of different variants." The doubling or accumulation of traits may occur by the "fusion" of stories quite unrelated to one another.<sup>1</sup> I see no evidence that this accumulation need necessarily be a fusion of different variants of the same story. The influence of different variants of the same story upon one another is a frequent enough phenomenon, e.g., Grimms' *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* are known to have fused with the similar stories in circulation, but it would be interesting to know whether such influence causes the reproduction of an incident or trait in two forms in a single tale. Would the literary version of Cinderella with the glass slippers fuse with the popular version with the fur slippers and yield a new version in which Cinderella has two pairs of slippers, one glass and one fur?<sup>2</sup>

On the next page (p. 17) Professor Krappe remarks that "the triplet motif in the Balor story is therefore [because of an ancient and widespread fear of twins or triplets] most likely to be of late date and due to a contamination of the tale with twin legends." It is quite unnecessary to go so far afield; the fission of a single character into two or three is an event frequent in *märchen* and calls for no comment or explanation. Furthermore, the presence of such a fission in a tale is evidence merely that the particular version in question is derived from one in which the fission had not occurred; the fact gives no information about the comparative age of any other versions than the two concerned. Even granting the premises, I cannot see how the introduction into a story of a motif which belongs to primitive ways of thinking makes the combination one "of late date." The combination is, to be sure, later than the uncombined story, but it may none the less be very old.

A very interesting question is raised by the observation that "numerous" and "considerable" differences between a Homeric episode and a modern folk-tale furnish evidence that "the literary borrowing, if such be presumed, must have taken place a good many centuries ago" (p. 46). Our information regarding the rate of change in incidents taken from literary sources and set adrift in popular tradition is scanty in the extreme.<sup>3</sup>

Apparently Professor Krappe is inclined to select as original that trait which is most abundantly represented and to reject "isolated" traits.<sup>4</sup> The dangers of this procedure have been pointed out repeatedly.<sup>5</sup> The trait selected should provide an explanation for all the variations. If it fails to do so, more or less uncertainty must attach to it.

In brief, I find the book stimulating, but I feel much hesitation in accepting its methods without more explanation of what these methods imply.

ARCHER TAYLOR

<sup>1</sup> I should prefer "contamination" as implying an unconscious associative process to be contrasted with what is here described as conflation.

<sup>2</sup> This sort of argument appears to be used (p. 21) in regard to Ethnea and the cow.

<sup>3</sup> But see, e.g., John Meier, *Kunstlieder im Volksmunde*, pp. xix ff. From this example we see that a folk-song may depart very widely from the original in a very brief space of time.

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., pp. 61 ff., 65.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., A. von Löwis of Menar, *Zs. des Ver. f. Volkskunde*, XXV (1915), 155, 164.

*Poèmes judéo-français du moyen-âge. Publiés et étudiés par D. S. BLONDHEIM. Paris: Champion, 1927.*

Professor Blondheim, following the precedent of Darmesteter, publishes here two redactions of a study of four unpublished Judeo-French poems, consisting of critical text with commentary, adding also a contribution to the existing material on the *Elégie de Troyes*. One article had appeared in *Romania* (LII [1926], 17-36), the other in the *Revue des Etudes juives* (LXXXII-LXXXIII [1926-27], 27-51, 146-62, and 379-93). The author feels called upon to defend the repetitions, inevitable under the circumstances and which call for no defense, as one cannot fail to see the interest attaching to the juxtaposition of the two versions, each addressed to a special public, yet converging upon a definite focal point. The reader, if he is at first confused, is certainly impressed and enlightened.

The delimitation of the two provinces, that of the Romanist and that of the student of things Jewish, is no easy matter to carry through. At times, in this book, there is a certain interpenetration which the joint publication brings out. It is, for instance, curious to note that in Poem III, line 5, *pron* is translated 'beaucoup,' for the benefit of the Romance public, while in the other article it is given with a question mark, thus raising a problem that would be of greater interest to the readers of the first article. A more systematic cross-index would help to clarify the interpretation of this and other passages. The proverb *bia[u] chanter ennuie*, mentioned on page 6, is explained on page 46, i.e., to the readers of the *Revue des Etudes juives*, though it cannot be a common expression, since it is introduced as "ce proverbe, que Paul Meyer a déchiffré pour moi."

The first poem is a medieval song, rendered generally at Jewish weddings, a curiously frank, not to say *gaulois*, composition; in form, a kind of cento, in so far as the Hebrew lines are derived from a variety of biblical or talmudic sources. The oddity lies in the fact that these verses alternate with Old French lines, though it is true that Professor Blondheim shows us numerous parallels for the bilingual situation among the Jews in many parts of the world (Art. II, Introduction). The other poems are vernacular paraphrases of texts belonging to the festival liturgy. These specimens were discovered as forming a sort of appendix to a Mahzor, or festival prayer-book, but they are not, we see, extraneous material, their inspiration being that of the numerous *Piy-yutim* and *Selihoth* that serve to pad, often with verse so abstruse as to mystify even the well-informed orthodox, the already formidable ritual of the major holidays.

To the uninitiated, the presence of rhyme in the Hebrew strophic forms deserves a passing remark.<sup>1</sup> The editor gives, together with the Old French, a translation of the Hebrew originals, noting that verse renditions in the ver-

<sup>1</sup> There is what seems to be an inconsistency in the spelling of *Mahzor*, so given on p. 2, but written *Machzor* on p. 6. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* prefers *Mahzor*.

nacular are not literal; a little special research is necessary, in the case of the Romance student with an interest, however amateurish (as in the case of this reviewer), in Semitics, before he locates the complete Hebrew selections, stowed away in a separate chapter in Art. II. Here again, better co-ordination would have vastly increased the utility of the documents presented. A case in point is OFr *S'amor vos montrera*, translated from the original as follows: "le miséricordieux vous fera entendre 'je vous aime.'" As the work is arranged, one must seek out pages 13 and 62 in order to gather up the data on this line. The general impression, in fact, that one gains on opening the book is the vast amount of information, the care, and the substantial character of the scholarship shown in this rare field, in which Professor Blondheim and his students have done especially for this country a unique task; yet, in this particular work, it takes time before the reader begins to accustom himself to the organization. Could not a large amount of this labor have been spared by relatively simple means?

Some isolated points invite comment: It is not clear, for instance, why, in Poem I, line 2, the meaning, 'fiancé,' 'marié,' for *hatan* requires comment. This is certainly its acceptation in current Yiddish, as is also that of *cole* for *escole*, rendered 'synagogue' (p. 72; Yiddish employs *Schule* [shool] in that meaning; Professor Blondheim, neither here nor in *Parlers* [p. 107], takes account of this fact). Further, in Poem I, verses 37-38, what is the case agreement in

En fureur hostile et courroux  
Sera batuz ton sentier ... ?

Is there an instance of case breaking? To the reference concerning *escu de quartier*, it is perhaps in point to add a familiar one:

En lor cols pendent lor escus de quartiers [Roland, vs. 3867].

In the case of the line—

Roi ke son nom ét sént, énozez é hacez,

where the relative clause with the modified possessive is interpreted 'dont le nom' (p. 22), the construction is spoken of as an *hébraïsme flagrant* with parallels in French and other Romance languages. May one not add other languages? There is, for instance, the passage in Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*:

Al were they sore y- hurt, and namely oon,  
That with a spere was thirled his brestboon [vss. 2709-10],

i.e., 'whose breast.' The reference to the Codex Sassoon 368 brings out the fact that its dialect is still not settled and that the manuscript of this valuable work is unedited.<sup>1</sup> It is hoped that more on this subject will be forthcoming from Professor Blondheim or his pupils.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps a query is admissible as to the attribution of Eastern location of Poem I on the basis of the forms *bis* (for *biau*), *saver* for *sauver*. It is a question as what emphasis is to be placed on *raïsemblablement*; the editor is, of course, aware of the non-exclusive character of the phenomenon (Schwan-Behrens, III, 96).



It is perhaps ungracious to call attention to what might have been done in a study such as this. Yet, referring to such a passage as the last line on page 58, the reader more familiar with the Ashkenazic ritual might be somewhat intrigued by the spelling of the first word with final *samah* instead of *shin*, unless he is fortunate enough to have at his side the elaborate commentary of the Ion Tephilah and similar glosses.

The care obviously taken in the preparation of this publication has been effective in excluding virtually all misprints. An easily pardonable one is "indicattons" for "indications," on page 41. In connection with the typographical aspects, it might be interesting to consider, in studies where it is necessary to insert, in a Hebrew passage, a Romance word in Hebrew characters, the method of setting off such insertions for the sake of clarity.

A. H. SCHUTZ

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

---

*Dialekter og Dialektforskning.* By JOHS. BRØNDUM-NIELSEN. Copenhagen: Schultz Forlag, 1927. Pp. x+128. 28 maps.

This neat little volume makes a timely contribution to dialectology, a study now in a position to become a special field to itself within the broader domain of linguistics, and, according to Brøndum-Nielsen, one which is threatening to force a change in some of the long-established principles accepted by scholars in the wider field.

A brief Preface notices the value of dialect study for linguistics in general, and emphasizes the fact that since modern conditions are rapidly exterminating dialectal differences there is urgent need for prompt collection of this evanescent material. Part I, pages 8-62, on "The Methods and Results of Dialect Investigation," is divided into seven chapters: (i) "Main Points in the History of Dialect Investigation"; (ii) "Dialects and Dialect Boundaries"; (iii) "Linguistic Homogeneity within a Parish"; (iv) "The Dissemination of Dialectal Phenomena"; (v) "The Age of Dialect Boundaries"; (vi) "Sound Laws"; (vii) "Dialect Criteria."

It is interesting to note that a prize competition instituted in 1854 by the Danish Academy of Science stimulated interest in Scandinavian dialect study (p. 9), just as a competition held by the same body nearly forty years before resulted in Rasmus Rask's epoch-making study of the relationship of Old Norse with the other Indo-European languages. Various arguments for and against the existence of dialects are mentioned; Gaston Paris, for example, apparently denied their existence. Gauchat, a pupil of Paris, was quickly converted from this view, however, when he began to examine living dialects. Brøndum-Nielsen not only believes in the separate existence of individual dialects, but points out that they often occur in very restricted areas, including sometimes only a single town, or perhaps but a part of one



(p. 21). Clear and blurred dialect boundaries are referred to on page 22 as being in a state of "dead" or "living transition" (død og levende Overgang), terms which do not seem at all apt. One phenomenon very familiar to dialect workers is defined as follows:

If . . . . several different lines [of dialect division] . . . . fall near one another, fall together in one district of one size or another, deviating from one another or crossing one another, the boundary line will expand to a broad belt, and thus boundary lines or zones, often whole districts, will result, which are then transition districts from one central dialect region to another [pp. 22-23].

Especially applicable to conditions in the United States is the statement on page 23 to the effect that "settlement by foreigners within a . . . . region produces linguistic islands, where [the language] deviates more or less completely from that of neighboring districts."

Even more illuminating is the report in chapter iii of dialectal conditions in a tiny suburb of Aarhus with a population of 385. The minuteness of the examination may best be shown by reproducing here a table from page 24:

Position	Rigsmaal	Mixed Dialect	Jutland Dialect	Language of Some Other Parish	Swedish	Totals
Landed proprietor . . . .	9	.....	.....	.....	.....	9
Large tenants . . . . .	11	27	90	3	.....	131
Small tenants . . . . .	39	15	56	6	1	117
Laborers (gardeners) . . .	27	25	73	1	2	128
Totals . . . . .	86	67	219	10	3	385

It will be observed that the division into callings is very significant: Of the landed proprietors, few in number, all speak "standard" Danish; as we go down in the social scale, we find a greater percentage of mixed dialect and Jutland dialect speakers. The apparently disproportionate number of Rigsmaal speakers among the laborers is due to the shifting nature of this class of the population. Additional complexity and additional evidence of the thoroughness of the author's investigation are provided by the statement that the same individual has been found to shift certain of his dialect characteristics; he is likely to speak differently to his servant, to his children, to his neighbor, and to his minister. One woman who migrated from West Jutland fifteen years before used a mixture of the dialects of West Jutland, East Jutland, and Aarhus. The situation here is obviously like that in innumerable places in America.

Chapter v, again, contains something pertinent to the American field. Various dialect boundaries in Scandinavia evidently date from the division of the country into parishes; this division took place as long ago as 1400, and even earlier. It seems clear from this that we must leave America in order to find the basis of American dialects; but doing so will take us to England, in most cases, where the status of contemporary dialect investiga-

tion is hardly less chaotic than in America. *The English Dialect Dictionary* and the same scholar's *An English Dialect Grammar* are conspicuous contributions, indeed; but the dialects are so lumped together that gaining a clear idea of the phonology of any one is a desperate task, and establishing boundary lines is out of the question. These works throw hardly any more light on the English dialect situation—in so far as distinctly marked dialects are concerned—than H. F. Feilberg's *Bidrag til en Ordbog over Jyske Almuesmaal* did on Scandinavian dialects. The pressing need of the day seems to be a work on the modern English dialects modeled after Brøndum-Nielsen's: a careful study of dialect characteristics based on sound phonetic principles, accompanied by clearly drawn maps. The work of Brandl and Serjeantson<sup>1</sup> needs continuation. A. Vikar's *Contributions to the History of the Durham Dialects* (Malmö, 1924; privately printed) is a step in the desired direction, but it is only a step, as there are no maps, and the study is primarily an orthographical investigation. Even Joseph Wright's well-known volume on the dialect of the West Riding of Yorkshire leaves some doubt as to the boundary zones, and the same objection has to be made against H. C. Wyld's learned contributions. A linguistic atlas of modern England, like the *Atlas linguistique de la France*, or Jaberg and Jud's forthcoming *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz*, is sadly needed.

Chapter vi, padded here and there with classroom platitudes, as, for example, the fate of words in unaccented position and the rise of analogical formations (pp. 54-55), contains nevertheless some thought-provoking material. From his wide experience in the investigation of Scandinavian dialects, the author cautions "there is every reason for warning against a misunderstanding of the expression 'sound law'; we must be clear on the fact that a sound law is only an empirical formula conditioned temporally and locally; it is the result of observations; it is *our* work, not Nature's [p. 53]." But whether the results of dialect investigation are likely to overturn accepted sound laws the author does not say definitely.

It is pleasant to remark that one *desideratum* for dialect study, a periodical devoted exclusively to dialect material (p. 60), has already been achieved in America.

In general, Part I is an illuminating exposition of previous work in the field. At times the conclusions which the author draws, often mechanically, would be more convincing if they were substantiated by the author's own experience in the Scandinavian field. If results reached in France, Switzerland, and Germany were confirmed by Brøndum-Nielsen's investigations in the north, future workers might feel a little more solid ground under their feet. A slight omission is E. S. Sheldon's thoughtful "What Is a Dialect?" in *Dialect Notes*, I (1893), 286 ff.

<sup>1</sup> A. Brandl, "Zur Geographie der altenglischen Dialekte," *Abh. der k. Preuss. Akad. der Wiss.* (Jahrg. 1915), Phil.-Hist. Klasse, No. 4; M. S. Serjeantson, *Distribution of Dialect Characters in Middle English* (Amsterdam, 1924) (no maps).

Part II has three chapters: (i) "The Principal Characteristics of the Scandinavian Dialects"; (ii) "Some Danish Dialect Divisions"; (3) "The Principal Characteristics of the Danish Dialects." This section is accompanied by eighteen elaborate maps, one of the more interesting being No. 22, on the occurrence of the glottal stop. Here the methodical exposition of the author's own research may well serve as a model for the work of future students. Particularly to be commended is the literal application of the principles of linguistic geography; the behavior of every sound studied is carefully illustrated on a special map. Of the twenty-eight maps, twenty-five are on Scandinavia.

The lack of a Word Index is regrettable, as the dialectal variations of many words are imbedded in the text. On page 59, line 21, *Ikke-Tilsteværelse* is a misprint for *Ikke-Tilstedeværelse*.

In spite of these trifling shortcomings, this admirable work demonstrates that the distinguished tradition of Danish linguistic scholarship is continuing its productiveness; to its imposing list, which includes such names as Rask, Verner, Vilhelm Thomsen, Holger Pedersen, Kristoffer Nyrop, Otto Jespersen—to mention no more—we must add the name of the author of the present volume.

JOHN W. SPARGO

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

## BRIEFER MENTION

---

### JESSIE LAIDLAY WESTON

Miss Jessie Laidlay Weston, a frequent contributor to *Modern Philology*, died in London, September 30 last. She was in her seventy-eighth year, and since 1890 had been an indefatigable worker in the Arthurian field. She was educated at Brighton, Paris, and Hildesheim; late in life she received an honorary degree from the University of Wales. Like many of her generation, she received her stimulus toward Arthurian studies from the late Alfred Nutt. Her chief interest centered on the Holy Grail, to which she gave a pagan ritualistic interpretation, but her studies covered a wide area, including a translation of the *Parzival* into English verse, and touching upon the narrative history of Gawain, Ivain, and Lancelot. Her unflagging enthusiasm and unswerving devotion should long serve as an example to other scholars in this field.—W. A. N.

---

That no event in the history of scholarship has ever been celebrated with such éclat as attended the completion of the *Oxford English Dictionary* last spring is not surprising, for no other dictionary of any language even approaches the *O.E.D.* in scope or in fulness of quotations. The central feature of the celebration was a dinner given on Wednesday, June 6, by the Goldsmiths' Company of London in their stately hall to the editors and staff of the *Dictionary*. The hall itself is architecturally one of the most impressive in London—not excepting that of the Lord Mayor—and on this occasion was rendered doubly impressive by the rich hangings, the massive gold platters displayed on the wall behind the speaker's table, the beautiful glass and porcelain and silver and gold and linen, and perhaps most of all by the two hundred guests, representatives of England's aristocracy of intellect and power. The toast of the evening, "The Editors and Staff," was proposed in a witty and eloquent speech by the prime minister, Mr. Baldwin, and the response—briefer but equal in humor and interest—was made by Professor Sir William Craigie, the senior of the surviving editors. The toast to "Oxford University"—which has borne the whole of the enormous expenses of publication (£300,000) with the exception of the gift of £5,000 from the Goldsmiths' Company—was proposed by the chairman, Sir William Pope, professor of chemistry at Cambridge and prime warden of the Goldsmiths' Company, and the response was made by Dr. F. W. Pember, vice-chancellor of the Uni-

versity of Oxford and Warden of All Souls College. Canada and the United States of America were honored by the presence of several representative scholars among the guests.

Not formally parts of the celebration, but closely connected with it, were the honors conferred during the same week upon Professor Craigie. On Monday morning the papers announced that he had been knighted by the King; on Tuesday the University of Oxford conferred the degree of Doctor of Literature upon him, upon his co-editor Mr. C. T. Onions, and upon Mr. R. W. Chapman, secretary to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, Mr. Humphrey Milford, director of the Oxford University Press, and Mr. John Johnson, university printer; on Thursday Professor Craigie alone received the same degree from the University of Cambridge.

In conferring the Cambridge degree, the University Orator gave a brilliant demonstration of the capacity of the ancient Latin tongue to express the most modern of ideas. After a graceful reference to Sir William Craigie's connection with St. Andrew's as student and professor and to his scholarship in Scottish, Celtic, and Icelandic, he continued:

Tot deliciis si quid deesse putatis, illud, quaeso, consideretis, quod in urbe Americana mirabili, rotarum inter tumultus tranquillius, immensi Willelmioli  
 immotas praebet mugitibus aures,

immo turres splendoras et quercus pusillas Universitatis recentioris colit et verborum historiis quietem illustrat Academicam.

This is perhaps the first and only time that the "bellowsings of Big Bill" have been recorded in the monumental clarity of the language of the Caesars.—J. M. M.

Professor C. Carroll Marden, of Princeton University, has returned from Spain after a stay of some months as visiting professor for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He gave courses of lectures on the Spanish language and literature at the Centro de Estudios Históricos and at the University of Salamanca. These were well received, and were accorded much publicity by the Spanish press as a courteous act of reciprocity on the part of the United States.

During Professor Marden's stay in Spain he succeeded in supplementing his earlier discovery (1925) of a manuscript of the works of Gonzalo de Berceo. A study of this manuscript disclosed that a section of it had become detached at some unknown date and had been lost. During the month of April of this year he made a search for this lost portion in the province of Logroño, the part of Northern Spain from which Berceo came, and in the mountain village of Santo Domingo de la Calzada he located the missing folios among papers in the hands of the administrator of the estate of a local family. Thanks to a grant by the American Council of Learned Societies, he succeeded in acquiring these folios, and will edit them for early publication. The edition of his previous acquisition has just been published in the *Anejos de la Revista de Filología Española*, under the title *Cuatro Poemas de Berceo*

(*Milagros de la Iglesia Robada y de Teófilo, y vidas de Santa Oria y de San Millán*) nuevo manuscrito de la Real Academia Española (Madrid, 1928). This work contains a thoroughgoing treatment of the Berceo manuscripts, a study of the Riojano dialect and of the dialectal relationship of the new manuscript to other existing versions. It seems important to print this brief notice pending the searching review that such an important work merits.—G. T. N.

In publishing the *Biblia Medieval Romanceada. I. Pentateuco* (Buenos Aires, 1927) the University of Buenos Aires is rendering an important service to philologists. The first volume includes the Pentateuch. As the best manuscripts are incomplete, the present edition is a composite of three: wherever possible the text is based upon Escorial I-j-6, a thirteenth-century manuscript, the oldest existing. Next, when possible, the editors resort to Escorial I-j-8, a fifteenth-century manuscript, but representing a still older version. Third, when both these manuscripts fail the editors use Escorial I-j-3, probably of the fifteenth century also.

The text as published offers a mine of material for the student of Old Spanish phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicography. One sees a language in process of evolution and marvels that scholars possessed of the Hebrew should express themselves so clumsily in their native vernacular. There is no glossary, and only paleographical notes are given, so the field is open to other scholars. A Preface describing the manuscripts has been provided by Américo Castro, to whose initiative this important undertaking is due.—G. T. N.

No Dutch poetry after the manner of the *trouwères* and the *Minnesänger* has been hitherto reported from the thirteenth century. In the library of the University of Lund, Dr. Erik Rooth found a double sheet of manuscript, and from it he now prints in *Ein neuentdeckter niederländischer Minnesänger aus dem 13. Jahrhundert* (Lund: Gleerup, 1928. Pp. 59) sixteen fragmentary stanzas which show that medieval love-poetry was written in thirteenth-century Limburg. The find is interesting and instructive. I cannot quite follow the argumentation in the first footnote, regarding rhymes in *-ik*, and the references given do not make the matter clearer.—A. T.

Professor Manly's long-expected selections from the *Canterbury Tales* has now appeared (Henry Holt & Co., 1928). It is not the small volume originally contemplated but a book of over 700 pages. The texts include the Prolog, the Knight's, Man of Laws', Wife of Bath's, Friar's, Clerk's, Squire's, Franklin's, Pardoner's, Prioress's, Nun's Priest's, Canon's Yeoman's tales, the tale of Thopas, and practically all the links and prologs of individual tales. These are given from the Ellesmere text with a few corrections when the testimony of other manuscripts indicates probable error in Ellesmere. The apparatus, including a biography of Chaucer in which Professor Manly incorporates his latest discoveries, sections on language, versification, etc., a Glossary which gives both definitions and etymologies, and more than 150 pages of notes which

are crammed with new ideas and information, constitutes the greatest advance in Chaucerian interpretation since the days of Tyrwhitt. Six interesting plates from manuscript illuminations and a large, clear print, which will gladden the eye accustomed to that of the older one-volume editions, make the book attractive.—J. R. H.

*Libro del Poema chiamato Citta di Vita composto da Matteo Palmieri Fiorentino.* Part I: Books I—II, xv. With a Preface by Margaret Rooke ("Smith College Studies in Modern Languages," VIII, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4. Northampton, Mass., 1927). Miss Rooke's edition of Palmieri's long vision-poem is of great importance to all students of the *quattrocento*, as it now makes available for the first time a work which has figured in every modern history of Italian literature, and has yet remained essentially unknown. The taint of heresy under which the work lay apart for centuries made any early edition impossible; but it is strange that modern scholarship should have neglected so interesting and significant a work until this late date.

Miss Rooke's welcome text follows the famous Laurentian MS XL 53, the author's magnificently executed final version, and compares it throughout with Magliabechian II, ii, 41, using the latter especially to supply a number of illegible passages. The present volume contains a brief but pertinently documented Preface, and about the first half of the text. The second half (Books II, xvi—III) is promised in a forthcoming volume of the Smith College series. We await its appearance with great interest, postponing a more extended notice of the work until it is available in its entirety.—WALTER L. BULLOCK.

As No. 167 of its "Original Series" the Early English Text Society has issued John Trevisa's translations of three short tracts, the *Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum*, Fitz Ralph's *Defensio Curatorum*, and Methodius' *De Bygynnyng of þe World* (dated "1925 for 1924"). This edition, prepared by A. J. Perry, of the University of Manitoba, includes, in addition to a brief Preface and Glossary, an Introduction of 156 pages. In this study, Professor Perry gives detailed information about the manuscripts and the early printed edition of the *Dialogus*, an account of Trevisa's life and literary activities, and an analysis of the language of the manuscripts. The texts he prints from one manuscript with collation from others, and he includes the early printed edition of the *Dialogus*. Thus the volume contains not only texts not hitherto available, but the most comprehensive account of Trevisa now in print.—J. R. H.

In 1913, Dr. Karl Christ, of Breslau, rediscovered in the Palatine Collection of the Vatican Library various French manuscripts, carried there from Heidelberg during the Thirty Years' War. Of these he published, in 1920, the very important *Passion du Palatinus*, reviewed in this journal (XXI, 321 ff.). We are now indebted to him for the publication of another significant



drama from the same collection: the *Tragedie du Sac de Cabriere* (Niemeyer, 1928), a Calvinistic tragedy, of about 1570.

As Dr. Christ establishes in an Introduction, admirable for its thoroughness and insight, the outstanding feature of this play is that it applies the Senecan technique, approved by the Pléiade, to a contemporary event of extraordinary cruelty; namely, the sack of Cabrières—a peaceful Waldensian town in southern Provence—by Jean de Maynier, Seigneur d'Oppede, in 1545. This tragic occurrence, which clouded the last years of Francis I's reign, was recorded by Crespin in his *Histoire des martyrs* (1st ed., 1554), whence our unknown dramatist drew his play, which in turn he dedicated to Count Christopher of the Palatinate. Says the editor (p. 53): "Die Sprache zeigt den Schüler der Plejade, den Nachahmer Senecas." The action, divided into five acts by the use of the "chorus" at the end of the first four, is cast in Alexandrine lines, with alternating masculine and feminine couplets. The last feature is noteworthy in so early a Protestant play, more so than the identification of the unity of time with the "time" of the performance, a trait that is found as early as Rivaudeau's *Aman* (1561). And like Rivaudeau, the unknown author employs the *brodequin tragique* of the typical Renaissance drama. Thus, while the *Sac de Cabriere* was intended to further the Faith (cf. the plays of Desmases), its literary and psychological value is slight. In contrasting it (p. 56) with the tragi-comedies by other Protestants, the editor might properly have made a reference to H. C. Lancaster's *French Tragi-Comedy* (1907).—W. A. N.

Part V of Mr. Aleyn Lyell Reade's *Johnsonian Gleanings*, just published,<sup>1</sup> deals with one of the most obscure periods in Johnson's early life, that which extended from his admission to Oxford in 1728 to his marriage in 1735. It is a period for which we have few contemporary documents and concerning which the accounts of the early biographers are in an unusual degree confused and contradictory. Of the many problems which it raises, the most important is certainly that of the length of Johnson's career at Oxford. Did he, as Hawkins and Boswell thought, remain until 1731, or did he leave, after a residence of less than fourteen months, in December, 1729? This latter supposition, though maintained by Croker and after him by G. B. Hill, has hitherto failed to win general acceptance; it was combatted vigorously by Fitzgerald, and there seemed to be no way of harmonizing it completely with certain entries in the Pembroke records. Mr. Reade has subjected these records to a fresh scrutiny, and he is now able to demonstrate—quite conclusively, I believe—that Hawkins and Boswell were wrong and Croker and Hill right. The general results of this investigation were announced in the *Times Literary Supplement* for September 16, 1926, and September 15, 1927; we are now given the full evidence, set forth in the minutest detail in two

<sup>1</sup> *Johnsonian Gleanings*. By Aleyn Lyell Reade. Part V: "The Doctor's Life, 1728-1735." London: Privately printed for the author by Percy Lund, Humphries & Co., Ltd. 1928.

chapters and an Appendix. This is his most interesting contribution; nothing else in the volume is comparable in importance to it, though there is much that cannot safely be neglected by the serious student of Johnson, including a valuable study of the books in his undergraduate library (the titles of these were already known) and an elaborate biographical dictionary of his contemporaries at Pembroke.—R. S. C.

In A. H. Schutz's *The Peasant Vocabulary in the Works of George Sand* ("University of Missouri Studies," Columbia, Mo., 1927) the author aims primarily to make clear the meaning of those words in the novels of George Sand which either are not found in the standard dictionaries or occur in a sense different from that of standard French. The author's conclusions are best given in his own words:

The Bas-Berrichon-Marchois forms the basis of George Sand's peasant vocabulary. This word-stock is mixed with certain elements from other dialects, some from the older language, some probably from *argot*; add to these a considerable list of the author's own coinage. The whole mass of material is not the work of a philologist but of an artist in control of her material and with a keen eye for linguistic effect.

This valuable study is an example of excellent method and sound scholarship; it throws considerable light on words thus far unexplained, or, at least, thus far explained unsatisfactorily, and makes the reading of George Sand's peasant novels decidedly easier. As we should expect, the work of Mr. Schutz utilizes previous studies on the *patois* of Berry by Count Jaubert, Hugues Lapaire, and Mlle Vincent, and with these it compares favorably.

In the case of a few words Mr. Schutz does well to offer suggestions only and to refrain from accepting a doubtful and far-fetched explanation. A few remarks may be made here. Page 52: *Gerbaude* may be a compound of *gerbe* and *baude*; OF *baud*, an adjective meaning 'proud,' 'bold,' 'jubilant,' 'glorious'; here, possibly, 'glorious shock.' Page 61: It is doubtful if *raisons* in the first quotation means 'prayers'; it may simply mean: *adresser la parole*, or *explications*. Page 86: *monde* meaning 'person,' 'individual,' is doubtful in *M.S.*, pages 213, 239, and *M. au D.*, page 104. Page 24: To the discussion on *areau* may be added *arer*, an infinitive (cf. *Quatre Livres des Reis*). Page 33: The form *cabri* (cf. H.D.T.) could also be mentioned in connection with *chebris*.

The proofreading has been done with care; a few quotations appear with minor errors and certain references are wrong: Page 1: Millardet's review of Mlle Vincent's work is *Revue des Lang. rom.*, LX (1920), 464; *Revue de Phil. franç.*, Volume XXI (1919), is not to be found. Page 75: *S.v. bonnes gens*, the reference should read "I, Sc. 14." Page 87: *S.v. monde*, the first quotation (p. 223) is not to be found. In a study of this sort proper names like Sainte-Beuve might just as well be printed in full instead of being abridged.—HENRY E. HAXO.

Dr. F. Imle's *Friedrich von Schlegels religiöse Entwicklung von Kant zum Katholizismus* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1927. Pp. 287) is a study of Schlegel's religio-philosophic ideas which not only carefully motivates his conversion (Parts I and II) but continues through his subsequent Catholic period (Part III). The author by so continuing intimates his unwillingness to view Schlegel's conversion as spiritual suicide; he finds in those critics to whom Schlegel declines in interest after 1808 a surprising lack of understanding of the Catholic inner life. Though perhaps humanly less interesting, Schlegel's last period, we are told, is richer in scholarliness and in godliness. Always Schlegel is the romanticist and *Entwicklungsmensch* seeking, after his acceptance of Revelation, to penetrate the supernatural infinite as eagerly as he had once sought to grasp the infinite universe of his earlier romantic doctrine. The book gives evidence of a sympathetic understanding of Catholicism on the part of the author.—ALMA E. LUSSKY.

*Flaubert's Youth*, by Lewis Piaget Shanks (Johns Hopkins Press, 1927. Pp. 250), traverses again the period covered by the late René Descharmes in his doctoral thesis, *Gustave Flaubert ... avant 1857*. The work is addressed to the English-speaking reader who is particularly interested in Flaubert rather than to the specialist, although Professor Shanks utilizes all that has been done in the field. The book recounts the life of Flaubert to 1845, studies in some detail all his *juvenilia*, including the first version of the *Education sentimentale*, and demonstrates how even the callowest of these productions spring from the writer's own experience and temperament and how they foreshadow incidents, episodes, and passages in his mature works. Thus the book contributes to a clearer view of the man and the artist as a unity, and of all his greater books, from *Madame Bovary* to *Bouvard et Pécuchet*, as faithfully representing that fusion.

It may be that Professor Shanks overstresses the influence on the future artist of the hospital milieu in which he was reared and of the traits inherited from his parents. While the hypothesis that the portions of the first *Education sentimentale* that deal with Jules were grafted on the original conception has some support in a letter by the author, does not its significance consist in the fact that Flaubert could not, at that epoch, dispense with a *porte-parole*? that he had not yet reached the stage where he could begin the composition of a *Madame Bovary*? The character of Jules thus came into existence less as a foil for Henry than in response to the artist's need of a medium through which to express himself at a turning-point in his literary development.—A. COLEMAN.

Henri Bauche's *Le Langage populaire* (Paris: Payot, 1928. Pp. 256) is a reissue, with minor changes, of a work which appeared from the same publisher in 1920. This time, the subtitle, *Grammaire, Syntaxe et Dictionnaire du Français tel qu'on le parle dans le Peuple de Paris, avec tous les Termes de*

*l'Argot usuel*, is followed, rather surprisingly, by the words *Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie française*. It is surprising, in fact, that the French Academy should lend official approval to a work superficial in design and execution, devoid of historical knowledge, and apparently oblivious of the large bibliography of the subject. Our reason for noticing the work at all is that it seems to be symptomatic of impending changes in the French language which may prove to be of real importance.

A. Meillet is quoted in the Introduction as declaring that the French literary language of today is suffering from its artificial character. French writers have exhausted its resources of expression; to rejuvenate it they turn to archaisms, provincialisms, the folk-language (*langue populaire*), to newly forged words, to forced expressions. M. Bauche's aim is to supply a remedy where M. Meillet could find none; renewal of youth, he thinks, can only come from below, from the language of the common people of the Ile-de-France and the national capital. To the author, it is a "crime" to be indulgent toward foreign tongues (English here is the chief enemy) or to yield to linguistic regionalism (the *Félibrige* is singled out for mention). If the people's tongue were allowed to replace "correct" French, where would be the harm? If the expression *je vous cause* should make obsolete *je vous parle*, what matter, so long as the new expression is generally understood? Here is a return to the attitude of that curiously original person, Louis Sébastien Mercier, whose *Néologisme* appeared in 1802, and for whom there were no "ignoble" words. "The literary language," wrote Mercier, "belongs to him who is able to make it obey his ideas." And: "Ce mot n'est pas français, dit-on; et moi, je dis qu'il est français, car tu m'as compris."

It would seem that M. Bauche has converted the French Academy, more or less, to his ideas; apparently the Immortals are genuinely alarmed at the flood of English words and expressions, at the invasion of scientific terms, and at the cultivation of literature in patois; they wish by approving this mediocre volume to indicate the direction which efforts for the renewal of the French language may properly take. They may be right as to this, but it is unfortunate that the work singled out for approval should be so weak on the historical side and so oblivious of its many predecessors in the same field. It is also regrettable that practically no effort is made by the author to distinguish what is vivid, exact, or picturesque from the much that is hopelessly trivial or vulgar in the worst sense. Saner ideas of what is desirable in the transformation and expansion of the modern vocabulary could have been found in Darmesteter's *De la Création actuelle de Mots nouveaux dans la Langue française*, of 1877, or even from Emile Deschanel's *Les Déformations de la Langue française*, of 1898, capricious and unscientific as the latter work is. Both L. Sainéan and A. Dauzat have also written interesting books which deal with aspects of this subject and which have the advantage of showing evidences of historical perspective.—T. A. J.

## DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS

### CHAUCER'S SHIPMAN

*John de Roches*

v.

*John Hawley*

**A**FTER a lapse of five hundred years it is perhaps unfair to the parties litigant to reopen the case of *John de Roches v. John Hawley*. Such an action is justified only by the fact that the case furnishes a valuable cross-section view of the life of Chaucer's contemporaries; it is of special interest to those students who seek among Hawley's crew for the prototype of the shipman.

The case of Sir John de Roches (elsewhere Roche), knight, and John Hawley, esq., of Dartmouth, was tried in the Court of Chivalry before the Constable and the Marshal of England, the proceedings lasting from 1393 to 1401. The libel articles, the information, and the testimony of the witnesses in behalf of Roches, as well as the pleadings in Hawley's behalf, tell much concerning the character of Hawley, Resselton, and other shipmen of Dartmouth. The case is doubly interesting in view of its account of an expedition in 1385-86, which probably attracted the attention of Chaucer to a Dartmouth shipman. Professor J. M. Manly took notice of the case in this connection in his recent book, *Some New Light on Chaucer* (pp. 173-81). The abbreviated report of the case, contained in seventy-one membranes in Chancery Miscellany, Bundle 6/4, is valuable because it constitutes a complete record of proceedings in a court of chivalry; it is more complete than the report of the Scrope-Grosvenor case, the records of which are in bad order. In this paper I shall present only such of the pleadings and testimony as appear necessary to an understanding of the issues and those which for some reason are of unusual interest.

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The charge brought against Hawley by Roches was that Hawley's men had in March, 1386, robbed certain Breton merchants of ships and the goods therein which were being conducted under Roches's

safe-conduct to Brest, for the purpose of victualing the castle; that in August, 1388, in the Constable's Court of Brest, Roches was fined and ordered to make restitution to the merchants so robbed. In 1393 Roches sought to recover from Hawley the amount of the compensation and the fine incurred. The cause was heard in the Painted Chamber and in the White Hall at Westminster.

#### PLEADINGS OF PLAINTIFF

The libel and the several articles thereof in behalf of Roches I shall not quote, as the addition to the libel contains the charges and is fully illustrative of the pleading.

[French] Now comes before you, most honorable lords, Constable and Marshal of England, or your lieutenants in the Court of Chivalry, John de Roches by voice of addition and declaration of bills before filed in your Court by the said John de Roches against one John Hawley. At the time that the said John de Roches was Captain of Brest, he was charged by the Council of our dread lord the King to keep and maintain the safe conducts of Sir Thomas Percy. The said Sir Thomas granted and allowed his safe conduct to Guyhomar Maufuric<sup>1</sup> and certain other merchants; afterwards, the said John de Roches granted his safe conduct and special truce made by his lieutenant in his name to the said merchants for five vessels in which were placed five guards of our lord the king and of John de Roches to guard the said vessels with certain victuals bound for Brest for stocking it. There came certain men of John Hawley, the second day of March in the ninth year of our lord King Richard [i.e., March 2, 1385-86], by authority of the said John Hawley, and attacked and took the said vessels with the victuals from the possession of the lieges and guards of our lord the King, notwithstanding the aforesaid safe conduct, and overcoming them in the haven of Pontecroys and within the *raunsons* of our said lord the King at Brest. And they sent them away to the said John Hawley, and the said John Hawley approved and sanctioned the said robbery and made distribution of the spoils. Thus he notoriously and feloniously sanctioned and confirmed the said crime, for which deed the said John de Roches was legally sentenced before Sir Edward Dalyngrige, then lieutenant for the honorable lord the Earl of Arundel at Brest, [to a fine] in the sum of eight thousand francs and to satisfy the said merchants.

That this matter is true the said John de Roches is ready to prove with his body on the body of the said John Hawley under the penalty provided in the law, and the said John de Roches also demands that the said John Hawley in

<sup>1</sup> No attempt has been made to reproduce the variant spellings of proper names in the different rolls; but familiar names have been modernized.



this case of crime respond in his own person without other delays and that he be under arrest until it be determined after the court has the possession of his body.<sup>1</sup>

## ANSWER OF DEFENDANT

From the articles numbered 36, 37, and 38, and the statement following the forty-ninth, it appears that Hawley does not deny responsibility for the seizing of the vessels, but seeks to justify it; he brings a countercharge against Roches, alleging that Roches had allowed two vessels with topcastles to carry wine and other victuals to the haven of Landernawe, which was at enmity with the King. Roches in his replication denies this, and states that if such vessels were allowed to go to the King's enemies, then it was done in his absence during the truce between Brest and the castle of Roche Morys in Brittany.

## REPLICATION OF PLAINTIFF

At the conclusion of the forty-nine articles, Roches answers the countercharge of Hawley in the following spirited manner:

[Latin] ITEM: My honored lords, deign to know that Sir John de Roches in the entire process of this cause has said and does say that the justificatory matter proposed in this case in defense of John Hawley was and is false, especially in that part where he implies that the said John Roches and Philip Derneford, lieutenant of the said John Roches, took from the possession of the said John Hawley and his men two ships of the five about which the present action is brought and sent these ships to the camp of Roche Morys with victuals for stocking the said camp, then an enemy of our lord the King. This account in which the crime of treason is charged is manifestly false in that part, as John Roches then said and now says, and for defending this upon the body of the aforesaid John Hawley, then offered and now offers his body, and he prays the court that this may be done.

He further adds that, because these ships contained goods for victualing Brest, he had sent four guards, namely, Nicholas Alderwych, John Hagge, William Cheke, and Adam Blake, to guard the ships and to notify Hawley's men that the goods were intended for Brest and were under safe-conduct. Hawley's men took the ships and expelled the guards.

He names thirteen witnesses by whom he can prove this statement. In a different hand there is recorded on this membrane a

<sup>1</sup> All translations are abridged.



memorandum in French to the effect that according to the custom of the sea all persons who are on board ship at the time a capture is made are entitled to share in the division of the prize, and for that reason the witnesses produced by Hawley should be disqualified. This exception would be well taken at the present time under the rules of evidence relating to the testimony of principals and accomplices.

#### THE PREVIOUS TRIAL AT BREST

The next membranes contain copies of the indenture under which Roches had been appointed captain at Brest and a copy of the judgment rendered in the court of the Constable at Brest on August 6, 1388. The judgment relates the story of the robbery in terms almost identical with those used by Roches in his information. It differs in that six ships are said to be involved and in that Roches is quoted as saying that "the ships which Hawley took were not in the haven of Pontecroys, but on the high sea." This statement would have relieved him of responsibility in the action brought against him by the merchants if found true; it may be taken for granted that had the Court of Chivalry believed it to be true, the jurisdiction of that court would have ceased and this cause of action would either have been dismissed or transferred to the Admiralty Court, except possibly for the charge of treason brought against Roches by Hawley.

#### THE CHARGE OF TREASON

The charge of treason by Hawley against Roches was laid before the Court of Chivalry on Friday, the twenty-fourth of October, and a copy delivered to Roches on the next day; he again demands that he may prove his bill and the falsity of the charge of treason by wager of combat. He throws down his gage in court.

Many witnesses were summoned and testified at different places and at various times while the cause was pending; but as being illustrative of the manner of the examination, and as covering the issues for and against the plaintiff, it is necessary to use only a few witnesses who profess to have been eyewitnesses of the "Batel of Hawley's Barge."

## WITNESSES FOR PLAINTIFF

Robert Kermerwar and Yon Stopard were examined in behalf of Roches without the gate of the castle at Brest, January 8, 1394.

[French] Robert Kermerwar, of thirty-six years of age and more, literate, of free birth, sworn and diligently examined, was asked to whom the ships belonged. He answered that a part to him and the rest to certain people at Landernawe within the said garrisons of the seigniory of Leons. The ships were five in number, as certain other men before him had deposed, and they had permission to send their said five vessels into the haven of Brest; according to his best knowledge and understanding, Sir John de Roches was at that time in England. A barge of John Hawley and a vessel from Cherbourg and another from Calais attacked them. The witness further says and deposes that the men of John Hawley knew that the said five guards were in the ship and had come to them the day before. They said that the five vessels were on dry iand when the men of Hawley came to them by land.

[French] Yon Stopard, master and part owner of the vessel Saint Pierre de Plumauger, of fifty years of age and more, was produced in behalf of Sir John de Roches; being duly sworn and diligently examined on all the articles for the said part of the said Sir John, he was interrogated by the opposition in behalf of the said Hawley. Being asked if he had received anything or a promise of anything for his information on behalf of the said Sir John, the witness deposes and says that he has not. Concerning most of the articles he agrees with Robert Kermerwar, who has just been examined. According to his best knowledge, one-half of the victuals in the said ships was ordered for stocking the said castle and the town of Brest.

John Doway was examined in a room called "le Cayge" in Brest on the twenty-first day of January in the same year.

[French] John Doway of Conket of the age of sixty years and more, of free birth, produced as he says in behalf of Sir John de Roches, being sworn and diligently examined on all the articles and interrogatories on the part of Sir John and of John Hawley and the matter comprised therein, deposes:

That all the articles are true, that four ships attacked them, that one left its companions in the said bounds, metes, and limits. Being asked by whom they were taken, the witness says they were captured by a barge called the black barge (*appelé le noir barge*) of Dartmouth and a vessel of Cherbourg and another of Calais. The witness says that the ships were in the said haven of Pontecroys on the dry sand (*sek Sabulon*). Asked to whom they belonged, the witness says that Rauf Goddard was master of the vessel called Notre Dame de Trielyn and Yon Stopard, master of the vessel of Conket, and William Maufuric and William Hervy and many other merchants were owners of

the said goods. They were all men from within the *raunsouns* of Brest. Three ships were taken and two others were robbed as was set forth in the articles. The said witness declares that the men of Hawley knew that the said ships had safe-conducts as is stated in the 23d article and that the five guards named in the 13th article were appointed by the captain of Brest. Asked if the ships were taken by Hawley on the high seas, he says that three of the ships were on the dry sand in the said haven of Pontecroys and had not two swords among them except those that the five guards had. Pontecroys, Odiorne, and Wathian are one haven under diverse names. All the things he has said are a matter of public voice and fame, both at Brest and other places.

John Hagge was a witness for Roches in the Painted Chamber of Westminster on January 26, 1393.

[French] The said witness deposes that Philip Derneford, lieutenant for Sir John de Roches, granted the said vessels safe-conduct in his presence and the presence of Sir John Rankyn and Jac Pers, and that certain men of Hawley's, whose names he does not know, were present. The said five vessels were under safe-conduct and notoriously were in the bounds, limits, and metes of the said town and castle as is declared in the third article. Asked how he knew, he replies that the witness himself, Piers Penyststrong, Nicholas Alderwych, William Cheke, and Adam Blake were ordered by the said Philip Derneford, then lieutenant of the said Sir John at Brest, to conduct safely the said five vessels to Brest from the haven of Pontecroys in the bay of Odiorne. The deponent and his four companions were in the said vessels in the haven according to the orders and command of the lieutenant when certain men of John Hawley came by land to the five vessels and asked the five guards if they had safe-conducts for guarding the five vessels. They told them, "yes"; that they had the safe-conduct of Sir Thomas Percy, Captain at Brest immediately before the said Sir John, and that of Philip Derneford, lieutenant of Sir John de Roches. The safe-conduct of the said Philip Derneford was read openly before the men of the said John Hawley, who said it was good and sufficient.

Then the men of John Hawley said to the witness and his companions that they would aid them to conduct the said five vessels to the Foreland. Therefore, upon the surety and promise of these men of John Hawley and of the aforesaid safe-conduct, as this witness swears, he and Piers Penyststrong caused the Bretons to get ready two of the vessels and brought them into the Pole (deep water of the harbor), taking the road within the Foreland, leaving the three other vessels high and dry on land because they could not get several vessels afloat at that tide. Before the said two vessels could pass out of the Pole, there came the said men of John Hawley in boats and by force seized these vessels in the Pole in the said haven of Pontecroys and took them

out of the possession of the witness and Piers Penyststrong, before mentioned, notwithstanding the safe-conduct and the promise before named.

Then the said witness and Piers Penyststrong departed, leaving the other three vessels in the power and jurisdiction of the said men of John Hawley, who then by force robbed the vessels. He says that he knew well that the boat in which these men came to them was the boat of the barge of John Hawley.

In regard to the fourteenth article he says that the ships were five in number and belonged to Guyhomar Maufuric, Guilliam Hervy, and Yon de Cornewalle, because he knew well they (naming them) came to Brest to obtain the said safe-conducts for the five vessels. Asked how he knew that the said three merchants were of the land of the seigniory of Leons and of the obeisance of the Duke of Brittany, he says he knows their homes and the places in which they live and they are in the land of the seigniory of Leons and of Brest within the *raunsouns* of the said town and castle of Brest, as is publicly and notoriously known, as well as by his own knowledge, sight, and hearsay. Asked how he knew that the wine and other merchandise in the said vessels were intended for the garrison at Brest, he said he knew because he himself and his four companions were appointed to take them to Brest, as he said before. Yes, he had seen the safe-conduct which Sir Thomas Percy had granted these merchants. He also had knowledge of the fact that Sir John de Roches had received express command from the Council of our lord the King to maintain and continue the safe-conducts granted before he took office as captain at Brest.

FLORENCE E. WHITE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[*To be continued*]



